BACONIANA.

VOL. VII. *Third Series.* JANUARY, 1909. No. 25.

THE ELIZABETHAN MAZE.

WORKERS in the Elizabethan maze of literature may find a few hints useful to them.

It is in the first place most necessary to clear their minds of prepossessions and prepare for the unexpected.

They will discover that young Francis Bacon was a prolific writer masked under many vizards.

Moreover, that he had a good conceit of himself and did not hesitate under one vizard to praise his work under another.

It will be as well also to start with a proper understanding of what he was and under what conditions he developed.

Finally, they should not set aside the biliteral cipher and its story as something they are prepared to take up when further proofs are forthcoming.

Without the cipher story you are pottering in the dark, and while able to assemble parts of the mosaic you will not succeed in forming its pattern.

Bacon was the unacknowledged because base begotten son of parents of abnormal position and ability, that is to say, child of a belated and secret marriage of Queen Elizabeth and Lord Robert Dudley, afterwards Earl of Leicester.

Brought up as the son of the Queen's confidential man of business, Lord Keeper Bacon, he was cared for and educated most thoroughly as a child who might be one day called to the throne. His remarkable mental development is indicated at so early an age as eleven in the terra cotta bust of him now at Gorhambury.

As a boy of twelve his education was continued at Trinity College, Cambridge, founded and endowed by the Queen's father.

He was there three years, under the special charge of Whitgift afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, and there came under the influence of Gabriel Harvey, a young and highly popular professor of poetry and rhetoric.

Most of the year 1576 was spent by Francis at the English Court, and he was the subject of much speculation among the courtiers as to what was his precise relationship to either the Lord Keeper and Lady Ann Bacon or to the Queen and Dudley. His true parentage was revealed to him as the result of an unpleasant incident, and in September of that year he was packed off for a tour on the continent, travelling to France in the train of the English Ambassador. He was abroad until March, 1579, and while away was supplied with money for his expenses by certain "friends" represented by the Queen's confidential official, Sir Thomas Bodley, who was gentleman usher to her private apartments. This gentleman in an extant letter exhorted Francis to make a careful study of the arts of government and the sources of national prosperity. In 1578 he made a short re-visit to England on the subject of his desired betrothal to the French King's sister Margaret, at that time unwilling to fulfil her contract to marry Henry of Navarre. Occasion was taken of this visit to have his miniature painted by Hilliard, the Queen's Court

Limner. His marked mental ability at this date is evidenced by the Latin words written round this portrait, coupled with his own admission that during this year he invented the biliteral cipher and carefully studied the properties of sound.

The remarkable range in his studies in classical and foreign literature is manifest from the writings under his earlier vizards such as "Immerito," "Watson," "Lyly," "Gosson," and "Spenser."

Like the Queen, his mother (to whose extensive library he would have access), he was an accomplished scholar, fluent in Latin and French and able to read Greek, Italian and Spanish with ease.

We can well understand that when this highly talented young nobleman came back to England his parents were proud of him, though it was impossible for them to formally recognise him as a prince. He appears to have spent 1579 partly at the Court and partly at Leicester House and seems to have been well supplied with money.

A poet by training and disposition he could not fail to have been inspired by the poets of France as to the important nature of their calling. Ronsard's efforts at the improvement of the French vernacular by the introduction of new words of classic origin and of words from old French, almost obsolete, would be known to him. Fresh from the influence of talented French and Italian tragedians and comedians, the clownish performances which passed for play-acting in his own country would be an abomination. Proficient in music and a student of the laws of sound, much of the crude piping which was called music in the country of his birth would be equally abhorrent. The decadence of the English poetic muse since the days of Chaucer was only too apparent. Current versification was nothing but dull forced rhyming.

He had not been many months in his own country ere he published a strong protest against the abuses of poets, pipers, and players, entitled "The Schoole of Abuse."

Amongst the English courtiers at that period there was a great unwillingness to print their attempts in the poetic art. Bacon had manifestly reasons of his own for secrecy, so that while his firstfruits were given to the world in the pen-name of "Lyly" he chose as vizard for "The Schoole of Abuse" young Gosson, then one of the boy players of the Queen's Chapel. As sanction for the practice he instances the habit of the poets of ancient times to mask their productions under other names or vizards.

Not content with his own efforts, he infected others with his reforming zeal and formed a small literary society (or areopagus, as Harvey called it), charged to bring about some improvement in English poetry. The little band consisted of Sidney, Dyer, Greville and himself, while Gabriel Harvey, his old poetical tutor, watched and applauded the movement from Cambridge.

In the "Shepheard's Kalendar," 1579, Francis, under his vizard of "Immerito," essayed to do for English what Ronsard was doing for French. Taking Chaucer for one of his models, he endeavoured to revive obsolete English words and phrases.

From this time onward his literary publications constituted one steady flow, masked, as they were, under the vizards of young university students who sought employment in London as clerks, transcribers and players. Spenser was a clerk with the Earl of Leicester until sent off to Ireland. Peele was a sort of go-between with the actors. Greene, Marlowe, Shakspere and Gosson were players. "Watson" and "Lyly" were mere names. Kyd seems to have had employment as law clerk at Bacon's chambers in Gray's Inn.

The important fact that the attempted biographies would not marry with the works, has been quite overlooked by the critics, who have been entirely deceived by the "vizard" method of publication.

The mystification was made more complete by Bacon's habit (no doubt intended to create the impression that the foundation of an English literature was not the work of one individual) of making his puppets refer to one another as though they really were writing independently.

Harvey, Phillip and Mary Sidney, Fraunce, Greville and Dyer, together with many more of the courtiers, were more or less in Bacon's secret. So were Sir John Davies and Sir Toby Matthew. Marston, Hall and Jonson found it out, as the late Mr. Begley has elsewhere shown.

But the general reader was kept in ignorance. Below I give some examples of the practice I have referred to.

To the first set of "Sonnets," published in 1582 under the name of "Watson," he wrote a preface as "Lyly" and complimentary verse as "Peele." When a number of his plays had been for some time before the public, he, as "Greene" in "Menaphon," made some mysterious allusions as to their authorship and tried to suggest "Kyd" as one of the authors. As "Nash" he wrote a preface to "Menaphon" and continued to disperse an inky fluid like the Sepia or cuttle fish, as means of escape. In this preface he fathered the play of "Arraignment of Paris" on Peele, notwithstanding that it had been published anonymously five years earlier.

As Watson in 1590 he alluded to himself as "Spenser," while as Spenser he alluded to himself as "Lyly." By 1592 he had practically dropped the "Gosson" and "Lyly" vizards and he then wanted to abandon the vizards of "Watson" and "Greene." In

publishing the last "Watson" work he wrote as C. M. (Marlowe), regretting his death and so forth. Of the death of "Greene," he, as "Nash," and with Harvey's assistance, made great play, commencing with a sort of death-bed homily to Marlowe and others. The "Spenser" allusion of 1591 is very interesting. Thalia, in "Teares of the Muses," says :—

> "And he whom Natures self had made
> To mock himselfe and truth to imitate
> With kindly counter under Mimick shade
> Our pleasant Willy, ah, is dead of late."

The verses proceed to explain how things have gone wrong with the stage, and that Willy

> "Doth rather choose to sit in idle cell
> And so himself to mockerie to sell."

I believe that "Willy" is, as other critics think, a reference to "Lyly," and its meaning is not very difficult to follow.

Bacon's earliest attempts at comedy would be the few plays performed by the children of the Queen's Chapel from 1580 to 1584, and presented as under the authorship of "Lyly."

"Campaspe," "Sapho," "Gallathea," "Woman in the Moon," and "Endimion," are all dry, poor stuff written by Francis in his youth, and it is natural to assume they did not go down very well with the gallants and ladies of the Elizabethan Court.

Francis, who was doubtless very much chaffed, became huffed and discontinued his Court comedies. The "Lyly" vizard was dropped and he was reputed to be sulking in his cell. The Spenser allusion gives us the reason why a "Greene" pamphlet of 1587 purports to be compiled from some loose papers found in "Lyly's" cell; and in Greene's Menaphon, 1589, "Lyly" is still described as slumbering in his melancholy cell. Young

Francis had evidently a notion of abandoning the "Lyly" vizard. But as "Nash," in the preface to the last named work, he takes the precaution of fathering upon Peele the "Arraignment of Paris," which had been better received than the "Lyly" plays, and was a play in which Bacon had experimented successfully with a variety of metres. A verse prefixed to "Menaphon" indicates that his Lyly vizard was thenceforth to be merged in "Greene."

We must never forget young Bacon's extraordinary egotism. He had no hesitation in referring to himself as

> "That same gentle spirit from whose pen
> Large streames of honnie and sweete nectar flowe,"

any more than at other times would he refrain from assuring any person associated by name with any of his writings that they would thereby be eternized.

Yet in both instances he was quite correct.

The Vizard "Thomas Watson."

Let me say at once that in my opinion Thomas Watson is a biographical myth. Nothing is known of him. His supposed biography has been compiled merely by inferences from the writings printed with his name as author.

To these inferences the contents of two mare's-nests have been added. One discovered by Mr. Hall and recorded in the *Athenæum* for 1890 was that Watson was the same person as one "Watsoon," brother-in-law of Swift, a servant of a certain "Cornwallis." The assumption depended upon the correct reading of an old MS. letter to Burleigh of March 15th, 1593, in which Mr. Hall thought he deciphered a statement that "Watsoon" "could derive twenty fictions and knaveries in a play which was his daily practyse and his living."

Mr. Ellis, in a letter to the *Athenæum* a few weeks later, pointed out that the word plott or plan had pro-

bably been misread as "play," inasmuch as no trace of a play by Thomas Watson had ever been found.

The other probable mare's-nest is an entry said to have been discovered by that doubtful investigator, Mr. Collier, in the register of St. Bartholomew the Less, viz., "26th Sep. 1592, Thomas Watson, gent, was buried."

The burial entry may be a forgery. It is suspicious that Collier found a similar entry in St. Bartholomew's register about Lyly, viz., "1606, 30th Novr. John Lyllie, gent, was buried.

The first "Watson" publication was in 1581, and consisted of a translation from Greek into Latin of Sophocle's "Antigone," together with a few Latin poems and four Themata.

The first of the four Themata is written in Iambics, the second in Anapæstic Dimeters, the third in Sapphics, and the fourth in Choriambic asclepiadean verse. Surely here is presumptive evidence of a poet at practice. Next year (1582) came the "Watson" publication called "The Passionate Century of Love," in which the young poet exercised himself in expressing English verse in sonnet form. These sonnets numbered about 100 in all; eight of them are imitated from Petrarch, twelve from Serafina, four from Strozza, three from Firenzuola, and two each from Parabosco and Sylvius. What a range of careful reading in Italian poetical literature this betokens! In addition he imitated four sonnets of the contemporary French poet Ronsard and two of Etienne Forcadel, another Frenchman also then living. In the glosse to the verses he indicates acquaintance with other poets, viz.: the Italians Ariosto, Baptista Mantuanus, Poliziano, the German Conradus Celtes, and with the Greek writers Theocritus, Sophocles, Musæus, Aristotle, Homer, and Appolonius Of Latin authors, he quotes or borrows from Ovid.

Cicero, Lucan, Senecca, Horace, Pliny, Martial and Flaccus.

One English poet had great attraction for him, namely, Chaucer. It is a suspicious circumstance that this old poet was also a great favourite with the writer of the "Spenser" and "Greene" works claimed in the biliteral cipher to have been written by Bacon.

In 1585 appeared under the name "Watson" a translation into Latin of Tasso's pastoral drama "Amyntas." Bacon's love of the pastoral form is shown in the "Shepheard's Kalendar," 1580, in the "Spenser" Colin Clout (1595) in the pastoral play "Arraignment" of Paris and some of the Eglogues published in the name of Peele. In 1590 "Watson" used the pastoral form for an Eglogue upon the death of his friend Sir Francis Walsingham. Another translation into Latin of Tasso's Amyntas was made by "Watson's" friend Abraham Fraunce, who was a barrister of Gray's Inn at the time Bacon was then resident. This Fraunce had access to the "Fairy Queene" two or three years before it was printed, as in his work called "Arcadian Rhetorike," 1588, are quotations from it. On the assumption that Bacon's claim to authorship of the "Fairy Queene" is true, this access was natural. Fraunce, moreover, like Bacon, was a close and intimate friend of the Sidney family. In 1586, in the name of "Watson," was published a translation into Latin of the short Greek poem by Coluthus called "the Rape of Helen." A lost translation of the same poem into English was according to a Coxetian MS. attributed to "Marlowe."

It will be remembered that in "Marlowe's" name was printed a translation from Lucan, and translations of Ovid's "Amores," and of the Hero and Leander poem of Musæus, a long time after "Marlowe's" death. With Lucan, Ovid and Musæus, "Watson" was familiar. Of other classical poets well read by "Wat-

son" we find Pliny drawn upon largely by "Lyly," Cicero by "Greene," "Homer," and "Virgil" in the biliteral cipher—Virgil again in the "Dido" of "Marlowe," Senecca and others in the "Shakespeare" plays.

In 1590 a number of Italian Madrigals were Englished by "Watson" and set to music by William Bird, who was a prominent Court Musician. That Bacon had a first class knowledge of music is well shown in his acknowledged writings.

The "Tears of Fancie or Love Disdained," another series of sonnets, was the last effort attached to the name of "Watson." Mr. George Steevens, the Shakespeare Editor, thought the "Watson" better than the "Shakespeare" Sonnets. I think the year of publication of the "Tears of Fancie" was 1592 and not 1593 as guessed by some critics. I say this, because a later date was inconsistent with Bacon's decision to drop the name of "Watson" and yet to retain the works in memory.

On November 10th (1592) was entered in the register a book entitled "Aminte Gaudea Author Thom. Watson. Londoniensi juris studioso." It was prefaced by a Latin dedication to Sidney's sister, the Countess of Pembroke, by a writer printing the initials "C.M.," who deeply lamented "Watson's" recent "death." This lament, which I think Bacon wrote as "C.M.," he followed up as "Peele" in honour of the Garter, 1593, with :—

"To Watson worthy many epitaphs. For his sweete poesie for Amintas teares."

"Then as "Nash" in "Have with you the Saffron Walden," he wrote, "A Man he was that I dearly lov'd and honor'd, and for all things hath left few his equals in England." Bacon in this way perseveringly maintained attention to his "Watson" writings, which, like his "Greene" works, ceased to appear after the year

1592. His "death" as "Greene" in September of the same year was a most daring joke.

Bacon's intimacy with the Sidney family was close and continuous. He lost a great friend and fellow worker in Sir Philip. His panegyrics in the names of "Spenser" and "Nash" show this. Another great friend was Sir Francis Walsingham, Sidney's father-in-law, whose death was fitly lamented in the Watson Eglogue to Meliboeus, 1590. Sidney's sister Mary, Countess of Pembroke, to whom the last Watson work was dedicated, was a talented writer and another great friend of Francis. One can almost conjure up the friendly group of three ardent enthusiasts translating Garnier's plays, when published in collected form in French in 1586, the Countess undertook "Anthony" Abraham Fraunce "Cleopatra" and Bacon "Cornelia" (published in the name of "Kyd.")

The "Shakespeare" folio of 1623, comprising certain of Bacon's revised plays, was dedicated to the two sons of the Countess.

To return to the "Watson" writings. The biographers say that Watson was in Paris in or before 1581, and that he was educated at the University of Oxford. The first proposition depends upon a statement in the Eglogue to Walsingham, which runs:—

Tityrus (Thomas Walsingham) sings to Corydon (Watson):

> "Thy tunes have often pleas'd mine eare of yore
> When milk white swans did flock to heare thee sing
> Where Seane in Paris makes a double shore."

Bacon, we know, was in Paris at various times during the period from September, 1576, to March, 1578—9.

Young Thos. Walsingham was heir to the family estates and, compared to his uncle, Sir Francis

Walsingham, was a rich man. He was 21 in 1589. If through his uncle's influence he was ever sent to Paris to learn French, he would have been a boy of 10 when young Francis was there. Young Thos. Walsingham's friendship for Bacon seems to have been exercised in another way, by his giving some refuge to Bacon's assistant, Marlowe, at the time he was being searched for under warrant from the Star Chamber in consequence of the libels on the wall of the Dutch cemetery.

In addition to the references to the Sidney and Walsingham family in the "Watson" works, there are references and dedications showing intimacy with Queen Elizabeth and her leading courtiers — the Earls of Essex, Arundel, Oxford, and Northumberland, Lord Chancellor Hatton and Lord Burleigh.

The relationship of Bacon to the Queen and Robert Earl of Essex is explained in the biliteral cipher story. Lords Burleigh, Arundel and Oxford were high Ministers of State, and to the last named Bacon, in the name of "Lyly," had already dedicated one of his books.

With regard to the allegation that "Watson" was educated at Oxford, it must be noticed that no person of that name has yet been identified as having belonged to any college there at a suitable date. The allegation is solely based upon the fact that a short Latin verse prefixed to "Tullies Love," 1589 (a pamphlet published by Bacon in the name "Greene"), is printed as by "Thomas Watson Oxon." The use of the term "Oxon" was most probably owing to the fact that a Catholic Bishop of Lincoln named Thomas Watson, educated at Cambridge, died in 1584 at Wisbeach Castle, where he had been in confinement for several years. This Bishop was author of several works, including a play called "Absalom," the MS. of which is or was in

the possession of the Pembroke family at Penshurst. Bacon probably used the word "Oxon" to avoid any inference that Bishop Watson wrote the "Watson" poems.

The internal evidence of the "Watson" writings seems to confirm their Baconian origin. "The Passionate Century of Love" contains several distinctly Baconian phrases.

Take one:—

"But how bold soever I have been in turning out this my pettie poor stocke upon the open common of the wide world."

Take another:—

"Homer in mentioning the swiftness of the winde maketh his verse to runne in posthaste all upon dactilus."

It will be remembered that Ben Jonson walked to Scotland about the year 1617, and in his conversations with the poet Drummond, of Hawthornden, is recorded that at his hither-coming Sir Francis Bacon had remarked to Jonson, "He loved not to see poesy go on other feet than poetical dactylus and spondæus." The following seems to be another:—

In one of the prefaces referred to "Watson" wrote, "Therefore if I rough-hewe my verse." In Webster's Dictionary the example for "rough-hewe" is given from "Shakespeare" for "rough-hewn" from Bacon. We also find the word "rough-hewe" in the biliteral cipher story.

In Sonnet 9 of the "Passionate Century," 1582, there is a reference to the "marigold," the favourite flower of Marguerite of Navarre. A similar reference is in Lyly's "Euphues his England," and in the cipher story we learn of Bacon's unsuccessful love affair with Marguerite, who was sister of the French King. The

"Passionate Century" contains a number of sonnets on the subject of "my love is past," which would suitably follow the failure of the courtship by Francis of Marguerite in 1578.

In the 4th Sonnet is an exercise in the Greek figure of rhetoric "Anadiplosis," one of those discussed in the "Arte of English Poesie." Mr. Rushton gives examples of the use in "Shakespeare" of twenty other of the figures of rhetoric explained in the "Arte."

The 47th Sonnet is used bodily in the early play of "The Spanish Tragedy" written by Bacon, but fathered upon Kyd.

The 53rd Sonnet deals with the subject of the Labyrinth of Crete and the guiding thread by which it might be entered and quitted. Bacon, in several places in his acknowledged and elsewhere in his "vizard" writings, refers to this Labyrinth, which seems to have greatly impressed him. One of his unpublished tracts is entitled "Filum Labyrinthi," and it is evident that his scheme of literary production was upon Labyrinthine lines.

In other places in the Watson writings are to be found such Baconian expressions as "Winter's blast," "nipping frost," "swelling seas," "the vulgar sorte," "swelling pride," "sea of teares," "Titan," "hapless case," "extremest justice," "void of equity," "smokie sighs," "fickle fortune," "surging seas," "thousand cares."

"The Teare of Fancie" has the line, "Go idle rhymes unpolished rude and base," which resembles the lines prefixed to the "Shepheard's Calendar":—

> "Go little booke thyself presents
> As one whose parent is unkent."

In the "Arraignment of Paris" (1584), attributed to Peele, a variety of metres is employed. In the

"Shepheard's Calendar" Bacon (under the subriquet of E. K., in the glosse) mentions Theocritus, Virgil, Mantuanus, Petrarch, Boccacio, Marot, Sanazasso, "and also diverse other excellent, both Italian and French poets whose footing this author everywhere followeth." "Spenser" and "Watson" therefore adopted like methods of acquiring facility in verse-making. As Spenser was a "vizard" for Bacon, so it is fairly evident was "Watson."

At an early stage in his development Bacon had mastered the mysteries of style. "Style," said he in the "Arte of English Poesie," "is as the subject matter." It is most interesting to see the early evidence in "Watson" of the readiness in which he could change his style. In the Eglogue to Walsingham we have:—

Corydon:

"But I must sorrow in a lower vaine,
Not like to thee whose words have wings at will
An humble style befits a simple swaine.
My muse shall pipe but on an oaten quill."

In another place:—

"But Tityeus enough, leave a while;
Stop mourning springs, drie up thy drearie line,
And blithely entertain my altered stile."

The "Watson" writings are very evidently the work of Francis Bacon; much of it early work, but none the less important. He and he alone was the law student of London who had at an early date visited Paris and was the courtier whose association with the Queen and her chief ministers was so close and intimate. He it was who had perfected himself in the literature of ancient Greece and Rome, of Italy, France and England, and who had taken all knowledge for his providence.

Suffering is considered by many necessary to the

making of a truly great poet. That Bacon suffered and was baffled in his efforts through life we know full well.

He was unhappy in his first love. He was refused due recognition as the eldest (because base begotten) son of the Queen. He had great difficulty in preserving his health, in maintaining a position for himself, and even in avoiding treachery and death. That he alternately desired and shunned death can be gleaned from his life history as it becomes more open to us.

The Sonnet 44 in the "Tears of Fancie," published in the name of "Watson," has therefore significance:—

"Long have I sued to fortune death and love
But fortune love nor death will deign to hear me
I fortunes frown deaths spite loves horror prove
And must in love despairing live I feare me."

PARKER WOODWARD.

NOTES.

Carmina Paulus emit, recitat sua carmina Paulus
Nam quod emit, posse dicere quisquis suum.
—*De Officiis. Cicero.*

IN my work "Bacon, Shakespeare and the Rosicrucians," published in 1888, I advanced the theory that Christopher Sly, (brought into the Induction of the *Taming of the Shrew*), was a side portrait, parallel or analogy, for an impostor, wearing "the giant's robe," and set up by the very person whose part he is made to play, in a position he had not the least title to, and that, too, in relation to the theatre and actors, of which he becomes the pseudo patron and spectator, *so long as the play lasts*. Baconians postulate the theory, Shakespeare was another Christopher Sly, wearing borrowed robes, and from his accident of theatrical impresario, finding

himself in the position to father plays sent to him for acting purposes. Since this theory was brought forward I have found, that a man of the name of Sly was associated with Shakespeare, in the theatrical licence of 1603 from King James the First. It must be obvious, (allowing the hypothesis to be examined?), that an author levelling his ironical portraiture at Shakespeare, would seek *to come as near him as possible without revealing his actual name*, for, as the plays were tacitly permitted to be issued under his authorship, the latter course would be impossible. In short, we find Shakespeare had a sleeping partner in his theatrical enterprise, and after his own name of Shakespeare, nobody could come nearer him, nothing could indicate him better, than the other sharer in this partnership of lordship of the theatre and actors. In his, *Geneologica Shakespeareana*, French says:—

"William Sly, a comedian, supposed to be the original actor of 'Osric' in *Hamlet*, was joined with Shakespeare in the licence of 1603, from King James. In relation to the conspiracy of John Somerville against Queen Elizabeth in 1583, 'an examination of Thomas Slye of Bushwood was made before John Throckmorton and Robert Burgoyne touching Popish Plots.' (Lemon's *State Papers*, Eliz. 1581-1590. Page 128.) Thomas Sly of Lapworth and his wife Susanna were witnesses to the will of Thomas Shakespeare, of that place, fuller, who appointed Thomas Sly, 'his kinsman,' to be one of the overseers to his will, proved May 18, 1658. Edward Slye was of Stratford, 7 James I. 1610."

It seems very improbable that Shakespeare should have chosen a name for satire and ridicule so closely allied with his profession and his family as that of Sly? At Rowington we find (in Warwickshire) Shakespeares and Slys lying in the same churchyard, and there are grounds for strong supposition that these two families

inter-married. Mr. French shows how, there were Slys at Lapworth, Stratford-on-Avon, and other places, connected with the name of Shakespeare. It seems to be quite possible that had William Sly been the leading or prominent partner in the theatrical licence of 1603, and William Shakespeare the second fiddle, we should never have heard of the name of Shakespeare at all, except, perhaps, in this Induction to the *Taming of the Shrew?*

Objectors to the Baconian authorship of the plays, upon the grounds of its strangeness, or improbability, need to be reminded that the thing is really old, as we find in the charge the poet Horace brings against Paulus—that "*He buys poems and recites them as his own,*" *for, as, Horace ironically remarks,* "*For whatever is bought anyone can call his own*" (*Officiis*).

How exactly Ben Jonson, in his poem, "On Poet Ape," (Epigrams), repeats this charge against someone, who Chalmers, (an editor of the plays), *was convinced was Shakspeare.*

Poor Poet Ape that would be thought our chief,
Whose works are e'en the frippery of wit,
From brokage is become so bold a thief,
As we, the robb'd, leave rage, and pity it.
At first he made low shifts, would pick and glean,
Buy the reversion of old plays; now grown
To a little wealth, and credit in the scene,
He takes up all, makes each manuscript his own,
And, told of this, he slights it. Tut, such crimes,
The sluggish, gaping auditor devours;
He marks not whose 'twas first. *And after times*
May judge it to be his as well as ours!

The footnote to this poem, in W. Gifford's edition of Ben Jonson's works, is interesting, and as it was penned prior to the year 1816, before the Bacon theory was started, it is worth repeating.

"*Poor Poet Ape Etc.* Mr. Chalmers *will take it on his death*, that the person here meant is Shakespeare."—(Ben Jonson's Works, W. Gifford, Vol. VIII. page 181.)

This poem was written with reference to a "*chief*" among the poets of the time.

> O imitatores, servum pecus, ut mihi saepe
> Bilem, saepe vocum vestri movere tumultus.
>
> —*Horace Epistolæ I., xix.* 19.

> Mean, miserable apes! the wit you make
> Oft gives my heart, and oft my sides, an ache.
>
> —*Conington.*

> The trade of others is replete,
> As others are with fraud and cheat,
> Such cheats as scholars put upon
> Other men's reason, and their own;
> A sort of drapery to ensconce
> Absurdity and ignorance.

In the church registers of Lapworth, in Warwickshire, are to be found repeated entries of the name of Sly and Shakespeare. Here is one borrowed from the pages of "A Warwickshire Parish," by Robert Hudson, 1904. The year is 1617 (16th February).

> "Johannis Shackspur et Maria Lucett, matromonis,
> Copulat. fuerunt Decimo sexto Februarii.
> Jocosa filia Edmond Sly baptizat, proximo
> die Marcii, et sepulta vicesimo die Maii.
> (20th day of May). (Page 152).

In these published registers there are carefully compiled figures showing how often certain family names recur. We find that, between the years 1561 and 1569, there are six entries of the name of Shakespeare—Shakesper (spelt ten different ways), and between 1590 and 1599 there are nine entries of the name. Total, 15 in 17 years. The name Slye [Slie, Sley, Sly] occurs six times in these same parish registers of Lapworth—six times between the years 1561 and 1569, seven times

between 1570 and 1579, eight times between 1580, and 1589, nine times between 1590 and 1599 (see page 303). Total, thirty entries during a period of less than forty years. "There were at this time, as shown by the register, certainly not less than four families of Sly in the parish, so that the name is one of the commonest." Not far from Lapworth is Knowle, and in the year 1506 appears in the register of members of the Guild of St. Anne, of Knowle, this:—

> "Rogerus Sley et Margareta uxor ejus de Lapworthe,
> Dnus Thomas Sly, Capellanus Cantarie de Lapworthe.
> (Page 83).

The last is Sir Thomas Sly, a relative of the above Roger Sly, who lived at Bromehall, and according to the author of "A Warwickshire Parish," was quite a gentleman, who lived in a patriarchal way on the best of terms with his neighbours. It will be observed that Christopher Sly in the Induction to the play of *The Taming of the Shrew*, makes a boast of his ancestry.

> Y'are a baggage, the Sly's are no rogues. Look in the Chronicles, we came in with Richard Conquerer.—Induction.

Perhaps Christopher Sly had heard of Roger Sly and Sir Thomas Sly, and that their names were entered upon the list of members of the *Guild of Saint Anne of Knowle?* It would seem as if the author of the play had something of this knowledge in his mind, for he makes Sly *swear by this saint!*

> *First Servant.*—My Lord, you nod; you do not mind the play.
> *Sly.—Yes, by Saint Anne do I.*
> —End of Scene i., Act I., *Taming of the Shrew*

It is interesting to find, in this same book of "A Warwickshire Parish," a letter addressed to Sir Nicholas Bacon, father of Francis Bacon (applying for a Writ of Subpæna in an action brought against the risk of alienation, against Thomas Grymshaw, of Packwood), written by members of this parish of Lapworth.

To the Right Honourable Sir Nicholas Bacon (Knight); Lord Keeper of the Great Seal of England :—

"In most humble wise complaining shew unto your Lordship your daily orators Humphrey Gower, William Ashby, George Walker, *Thomas Sly*, etc., etc., etc." (page 89).

This letter is without date, is endorsed "Bill unto the Chancery versus Thomas Grymshaw." Sir Nicholas Bacon was Lord Keeper between the years 1558 and 1578. In the church of Knowle there existed, (according to Dugdale's "Warwickshire"), the arms of the Belknap family, *a ladder placed against a Beacon*, on some of the stained glass windows. Philip Cooke, born in 1454, and son of Sir Thomas Cooke, of Gidea Hall, Essex, married Elizabeth, the daughter of Sir Henry Belknap, and sister and co-heiress of Sir Edward Belknap, by whom he had John Cooke, of Gidea Hall, Essex, who died in 1515, leaving by his wife a son, Sir Anthony Cooke, born 1504, preceptor to King Edward the Sixth and the grandfather of Francis Bacon. Sir Edward Belknap owned land in Warwickshire, and I think they are his arms that Dugdale depicts upon one of his plates. It is, in this neighbourhood of Knowle, that we get the earliest mention of the name of Shakespeare, at Temple Balsall, Rowington and Wroxhall. The last prioress of the Abbey of Wroxhall (which is quite close to Knowle), was Isabella Shakespeare, who is supposed, by Tom Burgess (in his "Historic Warwickshire") to have been the original of Isabella in *Measure for Measure*.

Among the laudatory pieces, published directly after the death of Lord Bacon in the year 1626, entitled *Manes Verulamiani*, which have already appeared in the Bacon Journal, is the following, in which *Francis Bacon is compared to the tenth Muse*, and Apollo is told he must remain content with being the ninth :—

"MANES VERULAMIANI,"

20.

IN OBITUM EJUSDEM, ETC.

Si nisi qui dignus, nemo tua fata (Bacone)
Fleret, erit nullus, credito nullus erit.
Plangite jam verè Clio, Cliûsque sorores.
Ah decima occubuit musa, decusque chori.
Ah nunquam verè infælix prius ipsus Apollo!
Unde illi qui sic illum amet alter erit?
Ah numerum non est habiturus; jamque necesse est
Contentus musis ut sit Apollo novem.

In this poem Clio is told to complain, and the sisters of Clio, because the *tenth Muse has fallen*, and the glory of the Muses. That is to say, Bacon is not only compared to Apollo but supposed to outshine him as the leader.

A most striking parallel to this threne is presented in the Sonnets, also connected with Apollo.

How can my muse want subject to invent,
While thou dost breathe, that pour'st into my verse
Thine own sweet argument, too excellent
In every vulgar paper to rehearse?
O, give thyself the thanks, if aught in me
Worthy perusal stand against thy sight;
For who's so dumb that cannot write to thee,
When thou thyself dost give invention light?
Be thou the tenth muse, ten times more in worth,
Than those old nine which rhymers invocate.—XXXVIII.

Apollo was the god of the sun, hence the allusion to light in the sonnet, and he is described as the leader of the choir of the Muses, by the surname Musagets. Amongst these muses were the muses of tragedy and comedy, of lyric poetry, and of epic poetry, as well as of history.

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

FOOTNOTES (FOR "THE TENTH MUSE.")

In the Lady Chapel of Worcester Cathedral was an epitaph prepared by Bishop Thornborough (fourteen years before his

death in 1691, at the age of ninety-four). The epitaph is as follows :—

Denarius Philosophorum Dum Spiro, Spero.

On the other side :—

In uno, 2°, 3°, 4°, 10° non Spirans, Sperabo.

A writer comments upon this as follows :—"The *monad*, or unit, in the Pythagorean philosophy, was not only the point whence all extension proceeds, but it further symbolised the first principle. The *decad* represented the line, bounded by two points, or *monads*. The *triad* stood for surface, or space, as length and breadth. The *tetrad* for the perfect figure the cube, containing length, breadth, *and depth*. The *Decad* or *Denarius* (the number ten) was used summarily for the whole science of numbers.

Observe that the sum of the first four figures constituting the cube or solid is :—1+2+3+4=10. Also it will be noted that the number *ten* is the first numeral of *double figures*, indicating a *second series of the first series*, and thus, by analogy, a second life, or new birth. Bishop Thornborough was addicted to Alchemy, and in the year 1621 put forth a book, entitled, "Dithothecoricos, *sive Nihil aliquid Omnia, etc.*" There can be no question that the figure ten is associated here with the hope of immortality, or second life, and it probably is applied to Bacon in a similar sense, *with regard to literature*, as one who, in "Ben Jonson's" words, "*had filled up all numbers.*"

WAS FRANCIS BACON CONNECTED WITH THE ROWINGTON AND BLACKFRIARS PROPERTIES AFTERWARDS ACQUIRED BY SHAKSPER?

IN the biographies of the Stratford Shaksper we find much said of his wealth in real estate, but if we read carefully the original documents relating to these different pieces of property we will discover a string tied to them, and if we follow the string or

thread of the Shaksperian labyrinth to its very centre we find some member of the Bacon family connected with it! See p. 595, 2nd Edition of Halliwell-Phillipps' "Outlines," where an "Extract from the Court Rolls of the Manor of Rowington, being the surrender from Walter Getley to Shaksper of premises in Chapel Lane, Stratford-on-Avon, 1602," is to be found in the original Latin. Halliwell-Phillipps (*Ibid.*, p. 129) comments as follows on this document:—

"On Sept. the 28th, 1602, at a Court Baron of the Manor of Rowington, one Walter Getley transferred to the poet a cottage and garden which were situated in Chapel Lane, opposite the lower grounds of New Place. . . . It appears from the roll that Shaksper did not attend the manorial Court then held at Rowington, there being a stipulation that the estate should remain in the hands of the Lady of the Manor until he appeared in person to complete the transaction with the usual formalities. At a later period, he was admitted to the copyhold and then he surrendered it to the use of himself for life, with a remainder to his two daughters in fee."

The Lady of the Manor who held the Rowington property was none other than Ann Russell, Countess of Warwick, whose brother, Sir John Russell, had married Bacon's beautiful aunt Elizabeth! I say emphatically that the most important documents yet discovered in the Shakesperian field connect the name of the Bacon family with that of Shaksper. The Northumberland Manuscript was a magnificent "find," wherein the names of Francis Bacon, in juxtaposition with that of William Shakespeare, is written many times by their contemporary John Davies, of Hereford. Two of the Shakespeare plays are mentioned in this manuscript, as well as a verse from "Lucrece"; also a "Device" composed by Bacon for his friend Essex, which was

played before the Queen (see Spedding's "Life and Letters of Bacon," Vol. I.). And when we come to the celebrated Blackfriars property purchased by Shaksper, we find that this property also belonged to the Bacon family. Matthew Bacon, of Gray's Inn, owned it in 1590 and sold it to one Henry Walker, of London, a musician, for £100 in 1604." In connection with this property Halliwell-Phillipps, in his "Outlines," 2nd ed., p. 161, says: "The premises referred to, situated within one or two hundred yards to the east of the Blackfriars Theatre, were bought by the poet for the sum of £140, and for some reason or other, he was so intent on its acquisition that he permitted a considerable amount, £60, of the purchase money to remain on mortgage. That reason can hardly be found in the notion that the property was merely a desirable investment, for it would appear to have been purchased at a somewhat extravagant rate, the vendor, one Henry Walker, a London musician, having paid but £100 for it in 1604."

In a note on p. 299, *Ibid.*, Halliwell-Phillipps has the following: "The estate came to Matthew Bacon, then or afterwards of Gray's Inn, in the year 1590, in pursuance of some friendly arrangements, and it was sold by him to Henry Walker in 1604 for the sum of £100. See p. 630, *Ibid.*, where a copy of this indenture is given in full. The original was owned by Halliwell-Phillipps and purchased from his collection by Mr. Marsden J. Perry, of Providence, Rhode Island. I find, after years of research, that a Mathias Bacon was admitted to the Society of Gray's Inn in 1597, *sine fine* (without paying the usual fee). Could this Mathias Bacon have been the holder of the Blackfriars property which was afterwards acquired by Shaksper? There is reason for this belief, because in the original deed of bargain and sale of the Blackfriars property, he is referred to as "Mathie

Bacon of Graies Inn, in the Countie of Middlesex, gentleman." Mathias is, I believe, the Greek form of Matthew. That he was admitted to Gray's Inn *sine fine* shows that he had some great influence back of him.* In this same Blackfriars deed "Anne Bacon, Widowe," is mentioned. Anne was the name of Francis Bacon's mother, who became a widow in 1579 and died in 1610. Anne Bacon was the name of his half-sister. His half-brother, Sir Nicholas Bacon, married Anne Butts, of Thornage. They had nine sons and three daughters. Their daughter Anne married Robert Drury, and Francis Bacon's half-brother, Nathanial Bacon, married Anne, daughter of Sir Thomas Gresham, Kt. Sir Nathanial had a daughter Anne also, who married Sir Thomas Meantrys, Bacon's secretary. Bacon's half-brother Edward had a daughter Anne also, which proves that the name Anne was a favourite one in the Bacon family.

Shaksper did not redeem the Blackfriars mortgage and "the legal estate remained with the trustees until 1618." John Heminge was one of the trustees named in this deed. Could this John Heminge have been the actor and alleged co-editor of the first folio to whom Shaksper left thirty shillings in his will for a mourning ring?

BASIL BROWN.

CONCERNING THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE SHAKESPEARE PLAYS.

IN attempting to settle the chronology of the Shakespeare Plays, the commentators have all assumed, as a matter of course, that the author of the Plays was one William Shaksper, or Shakspere, a native of Stratford-on-Avon, who came up to London about

* See Greys Inn Admission Register, 1596 (Folio 358).

1586, became an actor and shareholder in certain theatres, retired to Stratford, and died in 1616. Any evidence as to the original date of a given Play which is incompatible with the known dates of this man's career must, of course, be explained away so long as this theory of authorship is held. But it appears to me that there is evidence relating to the chronology of the Plays, which cannot be explained away, going to show that certain Plays were in existence before William Shakspere could have begun his dramatic career, and, on the other hand, that certain of the Plays known as "Shakespeare's" were, if not written, at least revised, after the time of the death of the supposed author.

The subject has been ably—and to me convincingly—treated by Dr. Theobald in his "Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light," by Prof. Courthope in his "History of English Poetry," and by the late the Rev. Mr. Begley in BACONIANA. Their position has been ably—but to me unconvincingly—opposed by Mr. Greenwood in his interesting and most valuable and scholarly book, "The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated." It may be only pride and vainglory that lead me to believe that I can add anything to the strength of the former three gentlemen's arguments, but those are infirmities to which we are all liable, and I will make the attempt.

I will begin with the consideration of the date of *Twelfth Night.*

The first mention we have of this Play is that in the Diary of John Manningham, who saw it performed in the hall of the Middle Temple, January 2, 1602. As his description of the Play is quite specific and minute, it has naturally been assumed by the commentators that it was then a new Play, and consequently a date shortly preceding this has been determined upon as that of its origin. Manningham's description certainly gives the im-

pression at first sight that he had been witnessing something quite new, but any such impression as this must, of course, give way before positive proof that the Play was in existence long before. It may well have been new to Manningham even if it had been written and performed many years before and if the production he saw was a revival.

In 1905 I sent to *Notes and Queries* the following, which appeared in the issue of Jan. 7, Vol. III., Sec. 10, p. 7 :—

> Tarleton, the Sign of "The Tabor," and St. Bennet's Church. In *Twelfth Night*, III. i., we have :—
>
> *Viola.*—Save thee, friend, and thy music: dost thou live by thy tabor?
>
> *Clown.*—No, sir, I live by the church.
>
> *Viola.*—Art thou a churchman?
>
> *Clown.*—No such matter, sir: I do live by the church; for I live at my house, and my house doth stand by the church.
>
> In Act V. i. 42, the Clown says: "The bells of Saint Bennet, sir, may put you in mind."
>
> Malone stated that "The Tabor" was the sign of an eating-house kept by Tarleton, the celebrated clown or fool of the theatre before Shakespeare's time. Boswell said that Malone was mistaken, and that the sign of Tarleton's house was "The Saba," meaning the Queen of Sheba.—See Boswell's "Malone's Variorum," 1821.
>
> In a recent pamphlet it is stated that Malone was right; that Tarleton's house was at "The Sign of the Tabor"; and that, moreover, it was next to St. Bennet's Church in Gracechurch Street or Gracious Street. If this is true the two passages quoted would seem to be most interesting topical allusions, and tend to fix a much earlier date for the play than is usually assigned to it. What are the facts, so far as can be ascertained? Was it "The Tabor"? And was there a St. Bennet's Church in Gracious Street?—*Quirinus.*

This elicited the following replies (Vol. III., Sec. 10, p. 55) :—

Tarleton, the Sign of "The Tabor," and St. Bennet's Church (Sec. 10, III. 7). The church of St. Bennet, or more properly St. Benet, stood on the east side of Gracechurch Street, at the corner of Fenchurch Street. I do not know the exact date of its demolition, but it was standing in 1856. Its site is now partly or wholly occupied by the roadway of Fenchurch Street, which was widened when the church was removed.—WILLIAM HUGHES, 62, Palace Road, Streatham Hill.

St. Benet, Gracechurch, was "called Grasschurch, of the Herb Market there kept" (Stow). The church, built previous to 1190, was destroyed at the Great Fire (1666), and re-erected in 1685 from the designs of Sir Christopher Wren. It was pulled down about thirty-five years ago. Cunningham says, "The yard of the 'Cross Keys Inn' in Gracechurch Street was one of our early theatres."—EVERARD HOME COLEMAN.

And Vol. III., Sec. 10, p. 73:—

Tarleton, the Sign of "The Tabor," and St. Bennet's Church (Sec. 10, III., 7, 55). As the distinguishing marks of Patch the fool were his fantastic costume and his bauble, so the wandering clown mounted his platform to the strumming of his tabor, from which he was inseparable. Hence the probabilities are all in favour of the sign of Dick Tarleton, actor and clown, having been "The Tabor" and not "The Saba," although "The Saba" is printed, I believe, in an early edition of Tarleton's "Jests," where, however, its pointlessness compared with "The Tabor" suggests that it is a misprint for the latter. In the passage in *Twelfth Night*, quoted by "Quirinus," the clown's reply to Viola's question, "Dost thou live by the tabor?" imputes a second possible interpretation of the question, namely, "Dost thou live by (the sign of) the tabor?" Viola's real meaning having been, "Dost thou gain thy living in the calling of which the tabor is the symbol?"

St. Benet's Church was one of the twenty-nine City churches pointed out for erasement in 1854. It was completed by Wren in 1685. Daniell, in his "London Churches," says that the church stood at the corner of Fenchurch Street and Gracechurch Street. It was a living united with that of St. Leonard, Eastcheap. The church was curiously planned, like many other of Wren's churches, to fill every inch of an irregular site.—J. HOLDEN MACMICHAEL.

There does not seem to be any reasonable doubt that the sign of Tarleton's tavern was "The Tabor" and not "The Saba," and that being the case it seems impossible to escape the conviction that the Play was written with a view to having the part of Feste, "the allowed fool," performed by Dick Tarleton. Of course the audience would have been well aware of his association with "The Tabor," and would have enjoyed the topical hit. But Tarleton died in September, 1588.

"This individual, the 'pleasant Willy' of Spenser, who died in September, 1588, was the most popular comedian of the day, one of those instinctive humorists who have merely to show their faces to be greeted with roars of merriment."—Halliwell-Phillipps' "Outlines," 10th edition, p. 93.

It seems impossible that this conversation between Viola and the fool should not involve a topical allusion; otherwise there is no special point in it. But knowing the character of Dick Tarleton and his popularity with the audience of the time, and considering the delight with which allusions of this kind concerning a popular favourite are always received by an audience—especially by the groundlings and the gallery gods—it seems, at least to me, impossible, in view of the number of pertinent allusions, not to believe that the character of Feste was written for Tarleton. This, of course, carries the date of the Play back at least to 1588, or nearly to the time which the Shakespeare commentators and biographers have settled upon as that of the exodus of William Shakspere from Stratford. But *Twelfth Night* surely is not one of the earliest of the Plays? It represents the full maturity of the author's genius. *Love's Labour's Lost, The Two Gentlemen of Verona, The Comedy of Errors, The Taming of the Shrew, King John, Richard the Second, Richard the Third,* and the three parts of *Henry VI.*—leaving *Titus Andronicus* out of

account—must have preceded it; also, according to all modern reckonings, *A Midsummer-Night's Dream, The Merchant of Venice, The Merry Wives of Windsor, Romeo and Juliet, Julius Cæsar,* and *Hamlet.*

In 1588 the young man from Stratford would have been twenty-four years old. Of course many things have been done by many men before the age of twenty-four—witness the record of Keats for instance—but never quite such things as the Stratfordian authorship of the Plays calls for in this case. The evident facts, in this instance alone, seem sufficient absolutely to exclude any such theory, when we take into account even the few undisputed facts in the life of the putative author. Francis Bacon at this time was twenty-seven. We know him to have been very precocious, and for several years previous to this date we are unable to trace any details of his life. It is a blank. We cannot determine what he was doing. So far as education, time, and opportunity go he had ample to have accomplished all this work.

Of course I do not claim that "Bacon wrote Shakespeare," a phrase of which one becomes rather tired, but it does go to show that the authorship by the man of Stratford is impossible, while it leaves the question of the Baconian authorship open.

There are a number of matters connected with the chronology of the Plays, all pointing in the same direction, which I hope to lay before the readers of BACONIANA if the Editor can give me space.

ISAAC HULL PLATT.

BACON IN THE SONNETS.

I NOTE in BACONIANA for October, 1908, Mr. Fred C. Hunt's criticism of my paper, "The Grave's Tiring-Room," found in the April and July issues. It would have been well if Mr. Hunt had waited until I had put in my evidence, as thus far I have been but outlining the field of the Sonnets, and so indicate in my paper. To instance, and with a touch of evidence, Sonnet 29 opens thus:

> "When in disgrace with fortune and men's eyes,
> I all alone beweep my outcast state."

Mr. Hunt admits that Francis Bacon wrote this Sonnet. We say it concerns his fall in 1621. Every phase of Bacon's fall appearing in *his* letters and papers appears also in the Sonnets, and belies their date. In a subsequent letter, Bacon, as to this "outcast state," says: "Time hath turned envy to pity [note "pity" in Sonnet 111], and I have had a long cleansing week of five years' expiation and more. Sir John Bennet hath his pardon; my Lord of Somerset hath his pardon, and they say shall sit in Parliament. My Lord of Suffolk cometh to Parliament, though not to Council. I hope I deserve not to be the only outcast." (Bacon's letters by Sped., Vol. VII., p. 549).

Does not this Sonnet 29 refer to the same identical trouble set out in Sonnets 111, 88, 89, 90, 121, 125, 140, 147, and others?

To instance again, and with evidence, in Sonnet 72 we have:

> "My name be buried where my body is,
> And live no more to shame nor me nor you."

Upon his fall Bacon at once made his will, which opens thus:

> "I bequeath my soul to God above by the oblation of my Saviour.

My body to be buried obscurely.
My name to the next ages and to foreign nations."

In his last will we have :

"For my name and memory I leave it to men's charitable speeches and to foreign nations and the next ages." (Bacon's Letters, Vol. VII., pp. 228 and 539. See Sonnet 55 as to "next ages.")

In the first will only the body is to be "buried obscurely," while in the Sonnet the name is to be buried where the body is. And so we would prefer not to be brushed to the ash-pit by Mr. Hunt's unsustained conclusions ere we have made our entry.

Did Bacon write no Sonnets after 1609? What trouble to 1609—the antedate—had Francis Bacon to warrant the use by him of language such as is found in the mentioned Sonnets? Let them here be read in full, please. Bacon's words, in Sonnet 111, can never be so tortured as to support Mr. Hunt's indefinite presentation. The branding of the name as to the external, and the desire for "pity" and "renewal" as to the internal, will never yield to his cue.

The death of Bacon's father, the bar will be my bier, and the Essex trial, will, jumbled or separate, never explain to the thoughtful reader the "outcast state" of Sonnet 29; the "My name be buried where my body is" of Sonnet 72; the "I can set down a story of faults conceal'd wherein I am attainted" of Sonnet 88; the "To set a form upon desired change" of Sonnet 89; the "Now, while the world is bent my deeds to cross" of Sonnet 90; the "No, I am that I am, and they that level at my abuses reckon up their wn" of Sonnet 121; and the

"Hence, thou suborn'd informer: a true soul
When most impeach'd stands least in thy control"

of Sonnet 125. We say Bacon's impeachment was the "brand" of Sonnet 111. We give evidence; does Mr. Hunt yield any?

Will Mr. Hunt inform the reader to whom the word "thou" in Sonnets 88, 89, and 90 alludes, if not to the King? See also Sonnets 34, 35, 49, 57, 58, 113, 118, 139, 140, and 147. Did not the King set Bacon right? Again, was not Bacon, as stated in Sonnet 88, attainted? Did he not, with his own hand, set down the particular detailed story of the faults concealed for which he was attainted, as stated in the Sonnet? If Mr. Hunt does not know where to find it we will point it out to him. Was not the King "foresworn," as stated in the Sonnet, in that he promised Bacon pardon if the Peers failed to recognise his merit on his voluntary submission, thus abandoning his defence? Neither the King nor Buckingham, fearing its disclosures, purposed to have it made. Note Sonnet 66, which applies to Buckingham. Do not the minutes of the House show this particular interview with the King? See Bacon's statement upon the interview in my former paper, page 157.

Upon Bacon's leaving the King (see Sonnets 113 and 57), touching the words "That thou, in losing me, shall win much glory" of Sonnet 88, we quote Bacon's letter to Buckingham at the time of his sentence, thus:

"My very good Lord,—

I hear yesterday was a day of very great honour to his Majesty, which I do congratulate. I hope, also, his Majesty may reap honour out of my adversity, as he hath done strength out of my prosperity. His Majesty knoweth best his own ways, and for me to despair of him were a sin not to be forgiven. I thank God I have overcome the bitterness of this cup by Christian resolution, so that worldly matters are but mint and cumin. God ever preserve you." (Bacon's Letters, Vol. VII., p. 282.)

Just before his fall he ends a letter to the King in these words:

"I have been ever your man, and counted myself but an usufructuary of myself, the property being yours; and now

making myself an oblation to do with me as may best conduce to the honor of your justice, the honor of your mercy, and the use of your service, resting as clay in your Majesty's gracious hands. "FR. ST. ALBANS, CANC."

—Bacon's Letters, Vol. VII., p. 226.

See in this connection Sonnets 26, 49, 57, and 58, and the words "To thee I so belong" in Sonnet 88. And did Bacon write this Sonnet prior to 1609? Mr. Hunt admits that he wrote them all. As to Bacon's word "oblation" found in our last quotation, see his word "oblation" to the King in Sonnet 125. Note the word "fortune" in Sonnets 25, 29, 37, 90, and 111, and in Bacon's Letters, Vol. VII., p. 218. Language features must, however, come later. The studious reader will do the writer a kindness if he will now read thoughtfully, and in full, all of the Sonnets referred to in this paper. The Sonnets are the true door to the entry of the Baconian mansion, unless you enter by cypher. See Sonnet 107.

Mr. Hunt at once throws mystery and doubt upon the 1609 date of the Sonnets when he tells us that the same edition was so printed as at the same time to be sold by two different persons and at different places. See what Hudson says of this in his introduction to the Sonnets. Note their title-page enigma, T. T.

This is not the only instance of the want of straight methods with title pages at this period and a little earlier, let it be noted by Mr. Hunt; and this, whether considered criminal or otherwise. As, in the plays, Bacon stands behind an assumed name; so, in the Sonnets, he stands behind an assumed date; and both name and date are but shields, and have stood now, as masks, nearly 300 years.

Mr. Hunt has no difficulty in accepting the first deception. If he ask, Can I make absolute proof that the date is wrong? I ask, Can he make absolute proof that the name is wrong?

It is not stated in his paper that the Sonnets purchased by Alleyn were the Shakespeare Sonnets, and if they were, see page 156 of my paper in the July issue. Want of space in the magazine makes me thus brief. To conclude, as the Sonnets are each a T.T., a tom-tit, a scholar's egg, for the unfoldment of light touching its author; so an egg will yield its meat, only upon cracking the shell. J. E. Roe.

South Lima, N.Y., U.S.A., Dec. 5th, 1908.

SOMETHING MORE ABOUT JUSTICE SHALLOW.

SINCE putting together a few notes on *The Merry Wives* for the last number of Baconiana, I have come across further facts germane to the matter. Mr. John Hutchinson, in Baconiana, January, 1908, put this question: "Is it not conceivable that Sir Charles Percy . . . may have come upon him (Justice Shallow) down Dumbleton way?" I find that Sir Charles actually alludes to Shallow in a letter quoted in the "Academy," February 6th, 1875. R. Simpson writes the article on "Shakespeare's Centurie of Praise," by Dr. C. M. Ingleby, and says: "A thin document that should come into Dr. Ingleby's next edition is a letter from Sir Charles Percy to Mr. Carlington (Carlton?) of December 27th, 1601.* Sir Charles had accompanied the Earls of Essex and Southampton into Ireland and was now returned to his Manor of Dumbleton, in Gloucestershire.

"'Mr. Carlington, I am so pestered with country business that I shall not be able as yet to come to London. If I stay here long in this fashion I think at my return you will find me so dull that I shall be taken

* Record Office; Domestic Eliz. of that date.

for Justice Silence or Justice Shallow. Wherefore I am to entreat you . . . take pity on me and as occurrences shall serve, to send me such news from time to time as shall happen; the knowledge of the which, though perhaps they will not exempt me from the opinion of a Justice Shallow at London, yet, I will assure you, they will make me pass for a very sufficient gentleman in Gloucestershire.'"

So much for the letter; then Simpson goes on to say:

"Can Sir Charles have been the object of any occult chaffing when Falstaff enquires: 'What said Master Dumbleton about the satin for my short cloak and my slops?'" (2 *Henry IV.*, I. ii.) Was is possible that the writer of that passage inserted the name of Dumbleton for fun in allusion to the remark made in his letter? Anyway the remarks of Percy are full of interest.

And now let us turn to *The Merry Wives* and see how Justice Shallow is described upon his first entrance.

Slender.—"In the County of Gloucestershire Justice of Peace and *Coram*.

Shallow.—Ay, Cousin Slender, and *Custalorum*.

Slender.—Ay, and *Ralolorum* too: and a gentleman born."

—Act I., Sc. i.

With these words in our mind's eye suppose we open Francis Bacon at his Law Tracts, and read in his "Office of Constables," "answers to the questions propounded by Sir Alex. Hay Knt. touching that Office (1608)."

The Office of Justice of Peace.

(After describing "Certain Gentlemen" who receive a Commission under the Great Seal to preserve the Peace, etc., Bacon says: "The chief of them is called *Custos rotulorum;* in whose custody, etc., etc. . . . Others there are of that number called Justices of Peace and *quorum* because, etc. . . . In every Shire . . .

there is a clerk of the Peace . . . this Officer is appointed by the *Custos rotulorum*."

I maintain that this shows that Shallow, as I had suspected, was drawn, not from any ordinary Justice but from a man who was the Chief of the Justices of his County. Is it possible to trace *who* were the eight Justices appointed by the Great Seal of England to Gloucestershire at the time *The Merry Wives* appeared? Also who the *Custos Rotulorum* was? I shall not be surprised if it was the Baron of Sudeley.

Information on this point would be of great interest. The question has been raised, If Sir Thomas Lucy was not the original of Shallow how about the Luces in the "old coat?" About that I am not able to decide at present. I have traced *Mullets* in the Chandos Arms; a mullet is a good, fresh fish. But, if there was any fear of the real Shallow taking offence at the representation of himself upon the stage, is it not in the bounds of possibility that Sir Thomas, Bacon's good friend, who was connected with him by the marriage of William Cook (Bacon's cousin), may have enjoyed posing as a mask to the real Shallow? To know the year in which the "Luces" first appeared in the Stage copies would assist the investigation. I should like to draw attention to the letter addressed by Bacon to Sir Thomas Lucy.* After writing such a cordial letter with a tribute of praise so prettily worded, it would be an impossibility to believe he would hold Sir Thomas up to ridicule in a comedy.

There is an interesting note in a letter of Carleton's from Chamberlain, 20th April, 1618, quoted in Spedding, Vol. VI., page 310, chap. vii. *re* Baptist Hicks.

"About this time we hear of Bacon going 'in all his pomp' to hear the Archbishop of Spalato preach at Mercer's Chapel, 'which was not so strange,' adds the

* Page 76, Rawley's "Resuscitatio," first part,

reporter, 'as not a month since to see him in the same State go to Sir Baptist Hick's and Barnes's shops to cheapen and buy silks and velvets.' As it is not said that this was his ordinary practice we may suppose that he found it convenient on that occasion to take them in his way from his Court."

Searchers after truth lay themselves open to criticism and I am interested to receive from Mr. Smedley the enclosed remarks from America on Baptist Hicks. The more light we can have on our subject the better. "Sir Baptist was a younger brother of Sir Michael and was also *a friend of Bacon's*." (This statement of friendship is not attended by any reference). The writer goes on: "He was born 1577, died 1629. Became King James' servant 1603, was knighted the same year. He kept a shop in Cheapside where he sold rich silks (to the Court largely) and in this way became very wealthy. Built Hick's Hall, 1610-12, was elected an Alderman 1611; built Camden House 1612. He was *interested with Bacon in the Virginian Company* and was one of those who purchased the Burmuda Islands from that Company 1612. There was certainly not one iota of Shallow-ness about him, or in his character. He was a shrewd, level-headed man of business and of large affairs. He distinctly told the Court of Aldermen (1607) that he did 'not intend to live altogether upon interest, as had been the custom after knighthood; but still intended to have a regard to his trade.' So Miss Leith will have to substitute some less level-headed Elizabethan than Sir Baptist Hicks for her Justice Shallow."

This is the view of our American correspondent. On the other hand Colonel Noel, a descendant of Sir Baptist Hicks, living in Gloucestershire, writes to Mr. Smedley that:

"It seems quite likely that the players might like to poke fun

at Sir Baptist Hicks. He would, in London, be a far more prominent character than Lucy—would the latter be known in London at all? Hicks was about the first citizen to keep shop after knighthood. His wife was a most imperious woman, and he had a great contest with the Alderman, about precedency, standing on his knighthood. This suit last for years. He was elected an alderman and paid a fine of £500 not to take it up. He had bought the manor of Hampstead and built a palace in Kensington, so that if he trod on the Player's corns, he would be a fine mark for their shafts. Do you notice that his first title was Baron Hicks of Ilmington in the County of *Warwick*. I have a fine miniature of him and a deed with his signature, which I should be delighted to show you at any time."

I leave the question to those interested in the subject, hoping that something may be proved one way or the other. I should like to say that reading Bacon one day I came across the words in juxtaposition, "*Barren, Shallow.*" I wish I could find the reference again; perhaps I may yet.

In the meantime if we turn to Bacon's Appopthegms (No. 50, folio 1671, page 230) we shall find an interview between a "rough-hewn Seaman" and a wise "Just-Ass"—an anecdote which clearly proves Bacon's opinion of a "gentlemen born" who pretends to "strength of learning," and is but a superficial, *shallow*, "*Just-ass*" after all!

The mistake of using "*nogus vogus*" for *nolens volens* is surely exactly on a par with Justice Shallow using *coram* and *rotolorum* for *quorum* and *rotulorum?*

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

[There is a fine oil painting of Sir Baptist Hicks in the Westminster Sessions House. and a magnificent recumbent effigy of him in Campden Church. A view of Campden House, which is preserved in the British Museum, shows a lanthorn similar to that referred to by Miss Leith in her former article. See Vol. VI., p. 106.—ED.]

THE GRAY'S INN CELEBRATION.

JUST 300 years have passed since Francis Bacon was made treasurer of Gray's Inn, and the Society celebrated the anniversary on Saturday, the 17th October last, by a luncheon given by the Benchers. Mr. Duke, K.C., treasurer of the Inn, presided, and in proposing "the immortal memory of Francis Bacon," delivered an oration in which Bacon's connection with Gray's Inn was fully dealt with. Mr. Duke made two points of special interest. The first had reference to the fallacious allegation in Macaulay's Essay, in which he states that Bacon came away from Cambridge with a supercilious mind—an ungrateful student. In combating this allegation it was pointed out that after Francis Bacon had attained a pre-eminent position at Gray's Inn, and the old master of Trinity (his old tutor) had been made Archbishop of Canterbury, Whitgift was enrolled among the Fellows of this house; and one of the first acts which followed was an act to which Bacon was a party, by which the Gate House was given to him as a lodging. The second point was the fallacy of the statement in the famous essay, that Bacon sprang suddenly into great practice as a young man, and during these early years gathered and squandered great gains in his work at the Bar. Mr. Duke pointed out that Bacon had been for eight years a member of the Bench before he was taken into public employment, and made reference to letters in which, year after year, Bacon besought aid in many quarters, saying that he must have a livelihood so that he might go on with the great task of his life—the Advancement of Learning. He mentioned that Bacon's first appearance in the Court of the King's Bench dated twelve years after he was called to the Bar, and his candidature for the office of Solicitor-General was

greeted with a chorus at the Bar that "he hath not come into the field at all."

There is cause for regret that no attempt was made by Mr. Duke to vindicate the character of Bacon except on the two minor points which have been referred to. The occasion was one which lent itself to such an object, but the treasurer was discreetly silent as to the allegations made by Macaulay in his Essays as to Bacon's conviction and the charges brought against him which were the cause of his downfall.

The American Ambassador, Mr. Whitelaw Reid, concluded a speech in which he did full justice to Bacon's intellectual supremacy by saying, "Never lived a man who had a better right to employ that humility in the pathetic bequest they had just heard: My name and my memory I leave to the charitable speeches of men, to foreign nations, and to the next age."

As to what extent Bacon is liable to censure, opinions still differ, but that the charges fulminated against him by Macaulay are grossly exaggerated, if not baseless, has been proved by Spedding in "Evenings with a Reviewer" and by Mr. J. M. Robertson, M.P. One cannot help wishing that it had been possible on such an auspicious occasion as this that the eloquent voice of Mr. J. M. Robertson might have been heard advancing such a vindication of the great Chancellor's character as may be found in the essay on Bacon appearing in his work "Pioneer Humanists."

The first night of the Michaelmas term was on the 2nd of November, and the members of Gray's Inn again celebrated the 300th anniversary of the famous treasurer's election, and on that occasion interesting booklets were presented to those present, containing a full report of Mr. Duke's speech on the 17th October and photogravures of Bacon, Queen Elizabeth, Sir Nicholas Bacon, and Lord Burghley, who was admitted in 1540

as a member of the Inn, of the accounts of Bacon with reference to the gardens, of Gray's Inn's walks as they were in the time of Elizabeth, and of Gray's Inn in 1905.

REVIEWS.

William Shakespeare: Player, Playmaker, and Poet; a Reply to Mr. George Greenwood, M.P. By H. C. Beeching, D.Litt., Canon of Westminster. (London: Smith, Elder & Co.)

It was to be expected that an attempt would be made to answer the position taken up by Mr. George Greenwood in *The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated* in view of the remarkable character of the reviews on it which appeared in the Press, and especially having regard to the appeals made by some of the reviewers to Shakespearean scholars to provide a reply which they—the reviewers—were unable to do. But few would have anticipated that a reply put forth with as much ostentation as is the present book would be so weak and ineffective. The so-called reply consists of three lectures delivered by Canon Beeching, which are now printed in book form: 1. Mr. Greenwood's Case Examined. 2. The Story of the Life. 3. The Character of the Dramatist. The latter two are not even of passing interest. They are two lectures delivered by Canon Beeching some time ago at the Royal Institution, and occupy about 70 pages, with the usual commonplace mixture of extracts from the writings of Halliwell-Phillips and other Shakespearean investigators, and guesses, inferences, and imaginings founded thereon which are the stock-in-trade of the literary hack. The only apparent reason for their publication is that the book may have sufficient matter to enable it to be bound in cloth instead of paper covers.

The first lecture, which has been delivered before the Elizabethan Literary Society and the Royal Society of Literature, purports to be a reply to Mr. Greenwood. Is it?

Canon Beeching starts with an attempt to place Mr. Greenwood on an inferior plane to that which he himself occupies. He says:—

"Mr. Greenwood is careful to guard himself against being supposed to ask whether Francis Bacon wrote the Shakespearean plays and poems, for that is a literary question on which men of letters would be entitled to the last word."

The inference which it is desired the reader shall draw is obvious—namely, that Canon Beeching, a man of letters, is coming down from his high vantage ground to do battle with Mr. George Greenwood in the latter's lower sphere—namely, the

arena in which evidence is weighed and considered. This is the Canon's method of introducing the work he is about to attack :—

"We have, in these five hundred pages, finished examples of most of the arts, from browbeating to persiflage, from innuendo to declamation, which make up the equipment of the successful practitioner at the Old Bailey."

This is the ingenious and disingenuous manner in which he excuses himself for not attempting to deal with Mr. Greenwood's masterly examination of the arguments put forth by Stratfordians in support of their case. Before finally dismissing this important feature of "The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated," the Canon says :—

"There are, however, two forensic artifices, as I must call them, of which particular notice must be taken, because they are likely to mislead."

The first is a reference to an ode written by Ben Jonson for the celebration of Bacon's sixtieth birthday, in which the well-known lines occur :—

"Thou standst as though some mystery thou didst,"

and

"'Tis a brave cause of joy, let it be known,
For 'twere a narrow gladness kept thine own."

Canon Beeching ignores the second quotation from the ode, and describes the first as "an example of considerable importance for the Baconian case, if not for Mr. Greenwood's." This remark affords evidence of the writer's ignorance of the Baconian case, which is not in the slightest degree affected by the ode. But what use has Mr. Greenwood made of this reference? In a chapter of 47 pages on *Jonson, Shakespeare, Shakspere and Bacon*, he devotes less than a page to his remarks on this subject, and concludes thus :—

"What was the 'mystery' which was being performed? The Baconians assert that here is an allusion to the secret Shakespearean authorship, a secret known to Jonson, and which he hoped might soon be published to the world. The Stratfordians, of course, reject this interpretation with scorn, but they are unable to give any plausible explanation of Jonson's meaning, and the mystery remains a mystery still."

The second forensic artifice is thus stated :—

"The other artifice which Mr. Greenwood himself allows me to call forensic is 'bluff,' and it is curious to discover that the very keynote of Mr. Greenwood's elaborate piece of architecture is nothing better. I mean his assumption that the difference between two spellings of Shakespeare's name is significant. Throughout his book he distinguishes *Shakspere* the player from *Shake-speare* the poet; as though this assignment of the two

spellings were not, as it is, a mere fancy of his own. but clear on the face of the documents and indisputable. There is, in fact, not a tittle of evidence to support it."

And, again :—

"The evidence, therefore, of any definite intention behind the inconsistent spellings of the name Shakspere or Shakespere or Shakespeare is altogether absent, and the elaborate pains that Mr. Greenwood takes all through his book to distinguish *Shakspere* the player from *Shakespeare* the poet, is, to use his own term, nothing but 'a form of bluff.'"

Now, what are the facts? In a notice to the reader prefixed to his volume Mr. Greenwood says :—

"In this work I have followed the convenient practice of writing *Shakespeare* where I am speaking of the author of the plays and poems, and *Shakspere* when I refer to William Shakspere of Stratford (*whether* he was or was not the author in question), except in quotations, where I, of course, follow the originals."

Mr. Greenwood therefore disavows any significance in the distinction he makes of the two forms of spelling the name, a distinction which he adopts for the purpose of convenience only. The Canon designates this "a form of bluff"!

In a lengthy note to Chapter I. of the Shakespeare Problem Re-stated, an account is given of the various forms in which the name is spelt, and after a number of these employed by the family have been enumerated, it is stated : "But the form *Shakespeare* seems never to have been employed by them. As Mr. Spedding truly says in his essay on *The Conference of Pleasure*, Shakspere of Stratford never so wrote his name 'in any known case.'" Surely, in Mr. Greenwood's reference to these two subjects, there is no display of forensic artifice. His statements are clear and incapable of misleading the reader. But what of Canon Beeching's allegations? They savour of that which is far more hateful than forensic artifice—the artifice of the theologian.

So far, then, Canon Beeching has not only failed in his attack, but discredited himself as a critic, for his weapons are those which are not compatible with honourable argument.

In a preliminary note Canon Beeching says : "In the first lecture I have had to put the section headings which express Mr. Greenwood's contentions into my own words."

In this first lecture he says :—

"To come now to arguments employed to show that the Stratford player could not have written the Shakespearian plays and poems, I will take them one by one and treat them as briefly as possible."

These are the fourteen arguments upon which the Canon,

having read Mr. Greenwood's book, alleges that the writer of that work bases his contention "that there is such a thing as a *Shakespeare problem* :—

1. The town of Stratford was insanitary.

2. William Shakespeare's father could not write his name.

3. There is no evidence that William Shakespeare ever went to the Stratford Grammar School.

4. Supposing Shakespeare went to the Stratford school—why should we assume that the school taught the ordinary Grammar School curriculum ? °

5. But Shakespeare did not stay long enough at school to acquire as much Latin as the writer of the plays shows evidence of possessing.

6. But, allowing that an industrious boy could get a knowledge of Latin at Stratford, he could learn nothing else.

7. There is no contemporary evidence identifying the player with the author of the plays and poems.†

8. It is hardly possible to conceive that the poems and plays were written in William Shakespeare's illegible and illiterate scrawl.

9. There is not a letter, not a note, not a scrap of writing from the pen of Shakespeare which has come down to us except five signatures.

10. Jonson wrote hundreds of occasional poems, lines to friends and patrons, elegies, epitaphs, epithalamiums. Where are Shakespeare's similar effusions ?

11. Jonson's death "was greeted with a chorus of elegaic and

° It would be difficult to find an equal to this as an example of misrepresentation in quotation.

† Canon Beeching (p. 17) endeavours to disprove this assertion by stating that Richard Field, who published the "Venus and Adonis," was a native of Stratford. On page 48 he speaks of Field as *his school friend*, and goes on to say that he, for one, chooses to believe that Field would have sent down to his friend at Stratford any books he could get hold of. There is not a particle of evidence to show that William Shakespeare knew Richard Field, much less that he was his friend. But there is evidence to prove that upon the outbreak of the pest in 1592, the year before "Venus and Adonis" was published by Richard Field, Francis Bacon, in company with Richard Cecil, Robert Gosnold, and Richard Field, rode down to Twickenham Park. They fled from pestilence, not like the Florentines in Boccaccio, to play and revel, but to pursue philosophy and discuss the laws of thought.—Hepworth Dixon's "Story of Lord Bacon's Life," p. 56.

panegyrical verses, poured forth by the best poets of the moment. How different was the case of Shakespeare!"

12. Ben Jonson's mysterious relations with the folio of Shakespeare's plays.

13. Jonson's commendatory poem.

14. The silence of Philip Henslowe.

Anyone who has read Mr. Greenwood's book will recognise that these are a travesty of the arguments there advanced. No one has ever suggested that because Halliwell-Phillips describes the sanitary condition of Stratford-on-Avon at that time as being to our present notions simply terrible, that would render it impossible for a man who was born there to write the poems and plays. No one has ever suggested that because John Shakespeare was unable to write his name a son of his could not have written the plays and poems.

Canon Beeching seldom quotes *ad literam*, but, as he admits, puts into his own words Mr. Greenwood's contentions. In this operation he distorts and misrepresents, so that not infrequently all trace of Mr. Greenwood's meaning is lost.

Canon Beeching never faces, but always dexterously evades, the fundamental arguments advanced in the Shakespeare Problem Re-stated.

In a note on page 17 Mr. Greenwood says:—

"I would point out that the negative evidence against the Stratfordian authorship is cumulative. It must be judged as a whole. A very small strain is sufficient to break one horse-hair, but a large number of horse-hairs combined together to form a rope will support a very heavy weight."

Mr. Greenwood's case is summed up in the words of the first doubter, Ralph Waldo Emerson, "We cannot marry the man to his writings." Canon Beeching has not brought them any nearer, and a reply to *The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated* has yet to be written.

THE *National Review* for January contains an article on "The Shakespeare Problem—the Evidence for the Defence." The writer, Mr. George Hookham, is on many considerations eminently qualified to deal with the subject. He is a scholar, a man of affairs with a sound, keen judgment, and has always been attached to truth for its own sake. The article is mainly devoted to an examination of the evidence and of the attitude, as witnesses on behalf of the Stratford claims, of Mr. Sidney Lee and the late Mr. Churton Collins. Mr. Hookham says:—

"In an action at law it is sometimes obvious, from the demeanour of the witnesses and the arguments they rely on, either that they are conscious of the weakness of the case they are supporting, or are ignorant of the strength of that they are opposing. If I should select, as I think I may without injustice to the other combatants, Mr. Sidney Lee and Professor Churton

Collins as the two champions who, by common consent, stand in the forefront of the Stratford battle, I should venture on the criticism that Mr. Lee falls under the former description of unsatisfactory witness, and Professor Collins under the second."

The statement of Mr. Lee which Mr. Greenwood calls flamboyant, but which Mr. Hookham describes as "grotesque in its exaggeration," is first examined. This is it: "Patient investigation which has been in progress more than 200 years has brought together a mass of biographical detail which far exceeds that accessible in the case of any other contemporary professional writer." Mr. Hookham says: "There would be a pleasant quarter of an hour for the Court, and a very bad one for Mr. Lee, if he were in the box and undergoing cross-examination on this bit of expert evidence." Mr. Lee has never been more dexterously handled, or more completely exposed, than in this article.

Comparing the attitude of the two men to the subject, Mr. Hookham says:—

"The temper of mind in which Professor Collins approaches the whole question is, no doubt, as impossible as Mr. Lee's; but an important difference is to be noted. He does fairly and honestly think that the controversy is neither serious in itself nor worthy of serious consideration. With Mr. Lee the case is far otherwise. Though his formal treatment of the problem is relegated to a few contemptuous pages in an appendix, his entire book is moulded by it. . . . A tradition is credible or incredible, an argument weighty or worthless, just as it happens to bear on the authorship of the plays. There is a desperate, almost despairing, anxiety to identify their author with Stratford. . . . Of all this there is nothing in Professor Churton Collins. He knows little of the opposite argument, and cares less . . . His worst fault is ignorance of a subject that repels him. In this matter ninety-nine-hundredths of the reading public are similarly situated."

Mr. Hookham states there are three pieces of strong *primâ facie* evidence that Shakspere of Stratford wrote the plays, and that Mr. Lee's "200 years of patient investigation have added no fourth."

"First, the similarity (not identity) of name on the title-pages, and the practical certainty that it had reference, plain or mysterious, to Shakespere the player; secondly, the fact that he was regarded as the author by many, perhaps most, of his contemporaries—a belief which he can have done nothing to disturb; thirdly, the verses of Ben Jonson prefixed to the First Folio, and the passage in his Discoveries. Every attempt to add to these has resulted in fiasco, or is itself obvious delusion."

Mr. Hookham does not advance one scrap of evidence in support of the second point. Nor is there any to be found. The third point is the stronghold of the Stratfordians, and this

cannot be carried until the battle is actually won at every other point. Jonson was the only contemporary of Shakespere who directly refers to him as connected with the plays, and there is no direct reference to him by Jonson until the 1623 edition of the plays was published seven years after his death.

The anecdote in Manningham's Diary (1601) has reference to the player only, and having in view the previous remarks in a performance of *Twelfth Night*, if there is any inference to be drawn, it would be that Manningham did not, rather than that he did, regard the player as the author of the plays. Neither the Nash reference (1589) nor the Greene reference (1592) can be held to apply to Shakespeare except by conjecture, and neither necessarily establishes any connection between the player and the author.

The Chettle ireference (notwithstanding Canon Beeching's recent effort at manipulation) cannot possibly apply to Shakespeare. Mr. F. G. Fleay, an ardent but honest biographer, is emphatic in this view,* and Dr. G. M. Ingleby, who is always fair, admits that the Chettle commendation cannot be applied to Shakespere without a violation of the text. It is necessary, he says, to interpolate a few words to the effect that Greene wrote his letter *to* divers playwrights, his friends and associates, and *against* another, his avowed enemy, and that two of these, *including the latter*, took offence.†

The words put into the mouth of William Kempe, the actor, by the unknown author of the "Return from Parnassus" (1601) do not necessarily establish a connection between the player and author. They certainly approach nearer than anything else; but they are by no means conclusive. Their value as evidence might be materially affected if it was known who was the unknown author.

Up to the publication of the folio edition, where there is the testimony of John Hemmings, Henry Condell and Leonard Digges for what it is worth and also that of Ben Jonson, there is not even the suggestion of any connection between the player and authorship. There is no contemporary evidence that Shakespere was a broker in plays, an actor manager, or even a holder of shares in a theatre. Not until in 1635 (19 years after Shakspere's death) when Cuthbert Burbage, his wife and son, present to the Earl of Pembroke, the Lord Chamberlain, their answer to the petition of grievances of Benefield, Swanston, Pollard, is there any mention of the fact that Shakspere was interested in any theatre in other capacity than that of an actor! Even then all that is said has reference to the Globe Theatre and is "and to ourselves (*i.e.*, the Burbages) we joyned those deserving men, Shakspere, Hemings, Condall, Phillips and others,

* "Chronicle History of the Life and Works of William Shakespeare," p. 111.

† "Bacon *v.* Shakspere," Edwin Reed, p. 152.

partners in that they call the profittes of the House." The statement as to the Blackfriars house is this :—"And soe (we) purchased the lease remaining from Evans with our money and placed men players, which were Hemings, Condall, Shakspere, &c."

In the former of these extracts is to be found the only evidence in existence that Shakspere had any connection with any theatre at any time other than that of an actor.

It is very significant that, three years after the second folio edition appeared, when the Burbage family in this petition were advancing every argument which they could rake up to obtain consideration from the Earl of Pembroke, making mention of their association with Shakspere, they only refer to him as an actor. Surely in addressing one of "the uncomparable paire of bretheren" to whom the first folio was dedicated, Cuthbert Burbage, had he believed that his deserving man Shakspere had been the author of the plays, of which a second folio edition had recently been published, would have reminded the illustrious nobleman of the fact.

It would be most interesting to learn upon what grounds Mr. George Hookham would justify his statement that Shakspere the player was regarded as the author by many, perhaps by most, of his contemporaries; perhaps these may be learnt from a second article which Mr. Hookham promises.

NOTES.

Dr. R. M. Theobald will early in the year publish a book entitled "The Classical Element in the Shakespeare Plays," written by his cousin, the late Mr. William Theobald. The volume will be a demy 8vo. of about 350 pages, and will be by far the most comprehensive work upon the subject which has appeared. The late Mr. Theobald was for many years deputy superintendent of the Geological Survey of India and was a member of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and of the Numismatic Society of London. He was an exceptionally gifted classical scholar. It was after his retirement from active life that he became a convert to the Baconian creed. His interest in the subject was

first excited by a lecture at which he was present, delivered by the late Mr. Ignatius Donelly in the Westminster Town Hall. Mr. Theobald was a member of the Bacon Society and a contributor to the pages of its journal. Dr. Theobald will be glad to receive the names of subscribers for copies of the book, which will be published at ten shillings.

* * *

THE Harvard Publishing Co., of Detroit, Michigan, has recently published a pamphlet of 12 pages, containing the Bi-literal Cypher of Sir Francis Bacon discovered in his works by Mrs. Elizabeth Wells Gallup and deciphered from the 1625 Edition of "The Essayes." Mrs. Gallup states in a short preface that the matter is of less importance than that deciphered from some of the other works of Bacon.

* * *

ARRANGEMENTS have been made with Mr. J. M. Robertson to deliver a series of lectures on Francis Bacon to the Society. The subjects which will be treated during the forthcoming spring session will be: (1) Bacon as Writer; (2) Bacon as Man; (3) Bacon as Political Thinker. Mr. Robertson, in addition to writing the great testimony to Bacon's worth, which has been referred to (p. 46), edited that admirable edition of Bacon's worth published in 1905 by Messrs. Routledge and Co.

* * *

THERE is published in New York "The Matilda Ziegler Magazine for the Blind" in two editions of raised type, one in Braille and the other in New York point. This magazine is the great means of uniting the blind and keeping them in touch with the world, especially with the best that is being done in industrial work. Through its agency the blind can purchase typewriters, watches, and safety razors at cost. In November over a

thousand dollars' worth of watches were thus distributed. These watches have raised points on the dials so that the blind whose fingers are insensitive can tell the hour easily. A blind person with sensitive fingers tells the time instantly by the light touch on the hands of an ordinary watch. The magazine is practically free owing to the munificence of Mrs. Matilda Ziegler, the widow of William Ziegler, who fitted out several Arctic Expeditions. The explorer, Mr. Anthony Frala, is the Treasurer.

* * *

To Miss Helen Keller, the distinguished American writer who is blind, deaf and dumb, the Editor of the magazine entrusted the making up of the Christmas number and the writing of the Editorials. Miss Keller has devoted a considerable space in the number to an account of Mr. Greenwood's *The Shakespeare Problem Restated*, and it is thus for the first time that the blind are enabled to read of the grave doubts that have arisen as to the authorship of the Shake-speare plays and poems. Miss Keller concludes her able summary of the book with these words:—"Some years ago I declared that I was in an impregnable fortress, that no siege of fact or argument could make me honour another than Shakespeare of Stratford. At the present moment I feel like the Pontiffs of Rome who could not meet without laughing in each other's faces because the religion in which they officiated was no longer the religion of the people. It is not time to be positive with reference to the Baconian theory; but Mr. Greenwood's masterly exposition has led me to the conclusion that Shakespeare of Stratford is not to be even thought of as a possible author of the most wonderful plays of the world. The question now remains, Who was William Shakespeare? How long must we wait, I wonder, for the solution of this greatest problem in literature."

Obituary.

EDWIN REED.

THE Baconian cause has lost one of its most stalwart champions in Mr. Edwin Reed, who died on October 14th. He was born in 1835 at Phippsburg, in the Lower Kennebec, the son of William Maxwell and Caroline Drummond Reed. Many of his ancestors were prominent in the battles and historical events of their time, *ex gr.*, at Bunker's Hill, and the war of 1812. Mr. Reed studied first at Bath High School and Bowdoin College, and then in Leipzig, where he resided for two years, and gained the classic knowledge and general culture which are amply shown in the books which he wrote. On his return from Leipzig he was offered a professorship, but declined and joined his brother, Franklin Reed, in the business of marine insurance and ship-building, in which he was occupied for fifteen years. At one time he was Mayor of Bath, Me. His departure is mourned by his widow, by four sons, and four daughters, and two sisters.

Many years ago Mr. Reed became greatly interested in the Baconian question, and the study of it and writing about it were his chief occupations. He twice visited England, lodged near the British Museum, and spent many hours daily in the Reading Room gathering materials for his work. His first writings were comprised in a series of pamphlets, "Bacon *v.* Shakespeare: a brief for the Plaintiff." And these, with copious additions, were subsequently, in 1896, gathered into a considerable volume bearing the same title. But this also was re-moddled, and re-appeared in a series of separate volumes, "Francis Bacon, our Shakespeare," 240 pages; "Coincidences," 152 pages; "Parallelisms," 420 pages (quoting 885 parellels between Bacon's prose and Shakespeare); "Noteworthy Opinions, *pro* and *con*," 79 pages; and a small volume of detached essays, 70 pages. And annotated editions of *Julius Cæsar* and *The Tempest* are likely to be published, having been fairly completed. Mr. Reed had a slight, feeble physical frame, and was frequently interrupted in his literary work by illness. His unresting work and consuming enthusiasm contributed mainly to the nervous exhaustion and decay from which he died. Mr. Reed's books are full of interesting matter, presented in a lucid and scholarly style. In the matter of indexes and references they might be improved, as Dr. Hull Platt remarked in the last number of BACONIANA. Mr. Reed was a most excellent letter-writer, delighting in humour and mock battle. If any memoir of him is published, a great many of these charming compositions ought to be included.—R. M. T.

Edwin Reed, "the Baconian"; it is well to have known him.

A small, compactly-built man, his distinctive dress a long, flowing cloak or cape fastened at the throat with metal clasps, he came walking slowly down the long aisle in "Barton," ever and anon staying his steps to give a cheery word of greeting to fellow-workers. His hair, snowy white, was cut somewhat as in the

Dutch fashion for children ; brows and eyes of a striking darkness ; nose short, yet strong ; a long upper lip above a mouth set closely, its lower lip slightly protruding ; hands and feet fine and small. Such was the outer man—a gentleman to view. Yes—a gentleman of an inner as of an outer distinction, of a genial and generous soul, of the older and more courtly school ; a man accustomed to command, but as a gentleman commands—from life-long habit—with a courtesy ever an essential part of himself.

He seated himself in his accustomed chair, and one listened and learned. Then he sighed a little, and, leaning back, seemed to meditate sadly. Unnoted sympathy studied him. Upon his face in repose settled a pathetic weariness, his mouth drooping like a tired child's. He evidenced a vitality drained and exhausted by the eternal Weltschmerz, that world-pain-and-sorrow from which no sentient soul is exempt. Yet courage, brave struggler, for yet a very few years and thou shalt be free, while thy earth-circles widen ever and for ever! Nay, what sayest thou of thyself ? " Write me as one who loves his fellow-men," his spirit quoted softly, and the whisper seemed to fill the alcove round about with sweet, sibilant echoings. Yes, good friend, such is indeed thyself ; and, if we read aright, hymning before thee when thou goest home angels shall herald, " This is one who had come through great tribulation ! " His the rest after agony, his the peace after pain !

. . . . . .

Some spoken words of his now come back to me : " You call this the B—— alcove ? " he commented, smiling. " A friend of mine amused me by stating that some day this world of ours will honour my poor memory (when I am dead, as is its backward way) by a window ' rich with storied glass,' placed even here in my favourite nook." " May it be so indeed ! " I cried with a glad vehemence. Still smiling he shook his head and sighed again, and so sighing wrote on. But I continued gazing until his bodily presence faded from my view ; and high in the middle field of that tall window, I saw his face all glorified and shining with the peace which passeth understanding, and is but born of pain ; and colour, like unto great music, a rhythmical glory of swelling harmony, lay round about, breathing over it, cool and refreshing as the greeny mists adown a forest glade. The greens of resurrected life were there, the violets of sweet woodland fragrance gleaming into deeply purple pools where rested the rich shadows ; while beyond them and below lay the crimsons and saffrons and gold of life's sunset. What matters now " the weariness, the fever, and the fret " of earthly life ? He is gone home.—Z. A. GILMAN.

" Man is of no value except as he immolates himself to an ideal." A life that has no central thought is like a derelict freighted with drift, and its story is the fool's motley. A dominant idea is the necessary helmsman to make a port amid the respect of men. No man has signally influenced the thought of his time

who has not first been conquered by an idea, and made its willing slave. He must have given it a loyalty keyed to self-sacrifice, and an enthusiam proof against bitter hostility.

The best years of the life of Mr. Edwin D. Reed were devoted to his Bacon quest. Able for his work through faith, eager mind, and profound scholarship, he turned away the ashes of years from the rich and vital Elizabethan life till he had his sensitive fingers on its throbbing pulse. Then that wonderful kaleidoscope of men elementally strong in thought, and passion, and achievement paled the simpler pictures of modern years till his whole intellectual interest rooted in the world of Shakespeare. His enthusiasm was so quick and vibrant that it kindled sparks of response even in the most stolid conservative. He loved to talk of his work, glowing in the vividness of his interest. His books breathe the author's sincerity, and they are forcibly convincing. If they do not convert the reader to Reed-Baconianism, at least they force him to admit that "much is to be said on both sides."

I knew Mr. Reed only in his old age, when the appeal of years, slow step and slightly drooping shoulders called forth all the maternal in a woman. But perhaps to know him then was best, as he stood on the summit of his years viewing his life from the hilltops, ripe in thought and human experience. What he saw of tangible success was disheartening. The best of himself had been gladly given to further the cause of Bacon, but his labour had met with no just recognition. In his several books he had garnered telling facts, and presented them with a fascinating interest—his work was good—but his words found few listeners, because a massy wall of prejudice prevented a fair hearing. Chagrin, indignation, the consciousness of a life-service counting for almost naught, might well have soured him, but to use the words of a man of the world who cherished him, "he had one of the sweetest souls I ever knew."

A strong, fine soul glowed from his face. His speciality had not made him a mere mind lost in the intellectual world of the past. Rather it served as dream to make his spirit winged. The Bacon argument became for him a phase of that great Truth to which every soul must cling else it perish. And his heart beat warmly human. He had an almost overweening joy in the good fortune and happiness of his children. A beautiful kindliness was in him. His life would show more material success had his faith in men been tempered by shrewdness, but honesty and noble simplicity would not allow him to impute unworthy motives to others. The fine fibre of the man was shown by a trust that individual treachery could not warp. And his reward was genuine love and admiration from men and women who honour truth and single-dealing. Sympathy and large friendship were golden links that riveted his friends. They loved him for the wholesome sweetness and genial charm of his nature; they admired him for his sincerity, his enthusiasm, and his scholarly achievement.—ALICE H. O'NEILL.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Canon Beeching's Reply to Mr. Greenwood.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

ON November 25th Canon Beeching read a paper before the Royal Society of Literature upon Mr. Greenwood's "Re-statement of the Shakespeare Problem." There are one or two points in reference to the production of this paper which may be noticed before considering the paper itself. It is considered almost obligatory for anyone reading a lecture to the R.S.L. that such lecture should not be delivered previously. Canon Beeching read his paper at the Toynbee Hall before delivering it to the R.S.L. Also it is usual, and it is expected, that any such paper should be handed over to the secretary of the R.S.L. to be published in the Transactions of the Society, though it may be subsequently issued independently. Canon Beeching has not acted thus; he has published his lecture himself, and the Transactions of the R.S.L. are ignored. In both respects his action is unusual, not to say discourteous.

What I have to say about Canon Beeching's lecture may be best introduced by the following correspondence :—

"To Rev. H. C. Beeching, etc., November 30th, 1908.

"DEAR SIR,—I heard your paper read before the R.S.L. last Wednesday, and, if I had had the opportunity, intended to ask you for one or two references to the "forensic arts"—"brow-beating, persiflage," etc.—which you said are plentiful—almost continuous—in Mr. Greenwood's book. I have read the book twice with great care, and I find nothing whatever of the kind. His book seemed to me invariably courteous to those whose views he combated. He had a perfect right to quiz Mr. Lee on his perpetual application of the word 'doubtless' to conjectural statements, and in a note in which he refers to this he points to twenty passages, and adds *et passim*. Of both Mr. Lee and Mr. Churton Collins he speaks with high respect as 'men of letters and scholars.' *Never* does he characterise their agreements as anything approaching to '*a conspiracy of fools*.' Surely you must know that by this kind of talk you put the saddle on the wrong horse, for it is not the Baconians or Mr. Greenwood who impute lunacy to their opponents, but Mr. Lee and Mr. Churton Collins. Who is it that talks about 'madhouse chatter'?—about the Baconian bacillus?—about 'the dancing madness of the middle ages'? To me your accusations seem scarcely honest—a flagrant violation of the ninth commandment. And as such I intend to characterise them in a notice I am writing unless you can show cause to the contrary. I am, Sir, yours very truly,

"ROBERT M. THEOBALD."

Reply, sent December 2nd.

"DEAR SIR,—You say that Mr. Greenwood is 'invariably courteous.' I have not Mr. Greenwood's book at hand, but his

references to Mr. Lee are *inexcusable*—most ungentlemanlike. In a footnote he referred to his change of name, and the very last reference in the book is, 'I thank thee, *Few*, for teaching me that word.' As an example of his general rudeness to Shakespeareans (a conspiracy of fools) see the references to them about the interpretation of Chettle—page 318, I think.

"H. C. BEECHING."

"P.S.—I write this not at all to deprecate any sort of criticism you may choose to pass on my lecture."

Reply.

"DEAR SIR,—Thank you for your post-card, which amply confirms my impression of your behaviour as ungentlemanly and scarcely honest."

It may be thought that, by this final reply, the Canon's fire is returned too heavily and too hotly; but on examination of his points of justification I am not inclined to soften it.

1. As to the reference to Mr. Lee's change of name, it is pretty generally known that Mr. Lee's original *Christian* name was "Solomon Lazarus." Mr. Greenwood (preface, p. x.) describes in detail the University honours obtained by both Mr. Lee and Mr. Churton Collins as described in the Oxford Calendars of 1873, 1880, and 1882. And he adds as to Mr. Lee: "For the benefit of the puzzled investigator (and such, at first, was I) it may be mentioned that he there appears under a slightly different form of appellation to those by which he is now familiar to us, not at that time having discarded the two Biblical prænomina in order to assume the more Saxon name of Sidney." That is all. The nature of the alteration is not specified, and the reason for noticing it is to clear up an ambiguity which had puzzled Mr. Greenwood himself. Perhaps it would have been better to have given these prænomina. The omission shows how careful Mr. Greenwood was to avoid anything offensive. Canon Beeching's accusation is rather disproved than illustrated by the instance he supplies. No reasonable person will see anything discourteous in this.

2. Mr. Greenwood, having himself occasion to employ the word "doubtless," indulged in the good-humoured chaff of thanking Mr. Lee for his example in the use of the word, and in doing so he used a well-known and hackneyed quotation from the *Merchant of Venice*. The same quotation might have been used for anybody under similar circumstances, and there was no reason why it should not be applied in this particular instance—unless, indeed, Canon Beeching thinks that the word *Few* is an odious epithet conveying discredit. At all events, the entire question is a matter of taste; there is nothing morally wrong or discourteous involved.

3. Mr. Greenwood is supposed to have characterised the agreements of various Shakespearean writers, in reference to Chettle, as "a conspiracy of fools." I am not sure that I can identify the passage which is supposed to convey this imputation. The words themselves are certainly not used, and I am inclined to deny, *sans phrase*, Canon Beeching's assertion; and to say that

such an imputation is *not* to be found in Mr. Greenwood's book. The author, after referring to a number of discordant (not concordant) speculations made by critics about Chettle, adds, as his comment, "Well! well! well!" (p. 318). If this is what Canon Beeching refers to I do not care in what terms his imputation is denied.

Moreover, when Canon Beeching seeks to defend Mr. Lee and Mr. Churton Collins from rude and violent criticism, he might as well ask himself whether these two are especially entitled to leniency. No good moralist will answer railing with railing; but when either a moral or a literary judgment is being recorded of those who are conspicuously intolerant and abusive, this fact may be allowed to have some weight in determining the attitude and tone of those originally misjudged and insulted when their time for reply comes; and considering this I think Mr. Greenwood has treated Mr. Lee and Mr. Churton Collins with far more gentleness than they deserve.

Canon Beeching devotes a good deal of space to the spelling of the word Shakespeare (etc.), and finds fault with Mr. Greenwood for using any kind of spelling *as an argument* for authorship. Mr. Greenwood has a learned and interesting discussion on the ways in which the word was spelt, but he distinctly repudiates the notion that any serviceable argument can be derived from it. He says, in the very first sentence of his book, "In this work I *have followed the convenient practice* of writing 'Shakespeare' where I am speaking of the author of the plays and poems, and 'Shakspere' where I refer to William Shakspere of Stratford, excepting quotation, where, of course, I follow the originals," and at p. 35 he writes: "Whether the Stratford player wrote his name 'Shaksper' or 'Shakspere' does not seem very material. It is more important to observe that he did not write it 'Shakespeare,' and still less 'Shake-speare.'" Now, when Canon Beeching laboriously confutes Mr. Greenwood's supposed argument derived from the spelling of the name Shakespeare, he is simply controverting what Mr. Greenwood never affirms but expressly disavows.

Canon Beeching blames Mr. Greenwood because he searches for hidden meanings in common-place expressions. For instance, when Ben Jonson says of Bacon, "In the midst, Thou seem'st as if some mystery thou didst." Whether Canon Beeching's explanation or Mr. Greenwood's conjectures about this or any other ambiguous phrase are right is of very slight importance, but in both cases there is an attempt to draw some definite meaning out of cryptic phraseology, and if this is to be condemned the whole of the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy may as well be abandoned, for it is nothing else. It is essentially an attempt to lift a veil—to disclose what is concealed. Canon Beeching's objection to this is simply an audacious *petitio principii*—a begging of the entire question.

As to any other matters in the "reverend" critic's discussion, doubtless Mr. Greenwood will deal with them himself. And he will have no difficulty in showing that the Canon ignores or

travesties his real argments, and occupies himself for the most part with irrelevancies and trifles.

I cannot help thinking that the whole of Canon Beeching's action, both in the lecture itself and in the mode of producing it, is throroughly discreditable, intellectually and morally. If "Churchmen's habits" are fashioned in this style, we may be well justified in preferring a lay costume. Of course, the ordinary newspaper critics will applaud Canon Beeching's answer to Mr. Greenwood as triumphant and conclusive.* They are beginning to do so already; but they are wrong. Mr. Greenwood's book is simply unanswerable, and Canon Beeching's attempt to answer it only makes its unassailable strength more evident.

R. M. THEOBALD.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

MISS LEITH in her very able paper, "Notes on the Merry Wives of Windsor," in the October issue of BACONIANA seems to have overlooked the fact that Thomas Bushel, according to his own statement, did not remain true to his master, Bacon.

Miss Leith states in her article (page 208, BACONIANA) :— "Thomas Bushel was the name of Francis Bacon's seal-bearer and friend, who remained faithful to him in his fall when others deserted him." Thomas Bushel was born at Cleve Prior in Worcestershire about 1594 and died 1674. Aubrey tells us in Cromwell's time "Mr. Bushel concealed himself in a house in Lambeth Marsh, where he constantly lay in a long garret, hung with black baize. At one end was painted a skeleton extended on a mattress, at the other was a small pallet bed, and the walls were covered with various emblems of mortality." Surely this was eccentric enough to frighten off even the spies of Cromwell, and would have inspired Holbein to add another picture to his Dance of Death.

But to return to Bushel's self-condemnation, we must look in Begley's "Bacon's Nova Resuscitatio," Vol. III., p. 29, where in a footnote we find the following :—

* Reviewers who take the trouble to read Canon Beeching's book do not so regard it. This is what the very able critic of the *Observer* says: "As a reply to Mr. Greenwood it is quite inadequate. Mr. Greenwood's was a painstaking and elaborate volume, crammed with facts and dates; Canon Beeching's is a thin book of 104 pages, of which 34 contain all that is intended as a 'reply' to Mr. Greenwood, the rest being a 'story of his life' of the usual vague and speculative type. Many of Mr. Greenwood's arguments are ignored; others are misrepresented or misunderstood. There is a strong—we believe an overwhelming—case against Mr. Greenwood, but no one would suspect it who had read only these two books."

"Thomas Bushel, one of Bacon's household dependents, gives this testimony to his master's character in a book 'The First Part of Youth's Errors' written by Thomas Bushel, the Superlative Prodigall London 1628, 8vo, printed two years after Bacon's death: A Letter 'To his approved beloved Mr. John Eliot Esquire.

"'The ample testimony of your true affection towards my Lord Verulam, Vicount St. Albans, hath obliged me your servant. Yet lest the calumnious tongues of men might extenuate the good opinion you had of his worth and merit, I must ingeniously confess that myself and others of his servants were the occasion of exhaling his virtues into a dark eclipse; which God knows would have long endured both for the honor of his King and the good of the Commonaltie; had not we whom his bountie nursed, laid on his guiltless shoulders our base and exercrable deeds to be scand and censured by the whole senate of a state, where no sooner sentence was given, but most of us forsook him, which makes us bear the badge of Jews to this day. . . . As for myself, with shame I must . . . plead guilty; which grieves my very soul, that so matchlesse a Peer should be lost by such insinuating caterpillars, who in his own nature scorned the least thought of any base, unworthy, or ignoble act, though subject to infirmities as ordained to the wisest.'"

BASIL BROWN.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

WITH regard to 'Richard Field and pastures new, I beg to draw your readers' attention to p. 62 (Note) George Greenwood's "Shakespeare Problem Restated":—"'Venus and Adonis' was printed by Richard Field, and Field was a native of Stratford; but there is absolutely nothing to show that Field had any acquaintance with, or any knowledge of Shakspere." Probably not; but what I wish now to do is to show that he had acquaintance with and knowledge of Francis Bacon (Promus, p. 71).

"Law at Twickenham for ye mery tales." Hepworth Dixon says (p. 56): "They fled (1592) from pestilence . . . to pursue . . . the laws of thought." Richard Field, Robert Gosnold and Richard Cecil were the friends Francis Bacon took flight with. "Venus and Adonis" came out the following year.

Yours truth,

A. A. LEITH.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

I QUITE agree with you that Dr. Anders's answer to the response to his own challenge to the Baconians is a ludicrous fiasco, than which none has ever more disgraced a literary man.

We doubt if any Shakespearean will accept Dr. Anders as a champion hereafter. Of all his specifications, the weakest ever is as to Mr. Sohmers's Number Ten. Mr. Sohmers quotes Judge Phelps, Chief Justice of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore and a prominent American jurist, who was examining "Slade's Case," which was pending from 1596 to 1602 and twice went to the highest appellants' court in England, a well-known Equity precedent reported in Coke R. Judge Phelps is no Baconian, and was not writing of a Baconian theory. But when he found that Lord Bacon was of counsel for the complainant in that case, and that his associate was an attorney named "John Halstaff," in view of the fact that no source for the name "Falstaff" has ever been discovered anywhere, Judge Phelps could not avoid exclaiming: "When the author of 'The First Part of King Henry the Fourth' found himself obliged in 1597 to find some other name to substitute for the offensive 'Sir John Oldcastle,' and to find it in a hurry, did he get it from the name of 'John Halstaff?'" ("Falstaff and Equity." Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1900). Dr. Morgan, in the "Morgan-Platt Debate," arguing the Shakespeare side ("New Shakespeareana," Vol. II., page 99), calls this a "bombshell."

To it Dr. Anders says (carelessly): "I can give no definite reply. Let me ask Mr. Sohmers whether there might be some link or connection between Sir John Falstaff in 'Henry IV.' and Sir John Fastolfe in the First Part of 'Henry VI.'?"

Suppose there were such a "link or connection"—O, great Anders!—how does that dispose of Bacon's colleague, John HALSTAFF? Wanting in a hurry a name to substitute for "Oldcastle" or go to gaol at the information of the Lord Chamberlain, the "Author of the Henry Fourth" goes BACK to the reign of a monarch two reigns LATER. (We admit, of course, that the two histories were written in reversed order.) But one wonders most whether Dr. Anders comprehends the significance of *cumulative* evidence at all!

I doubt if there is even a Baconian who would accept a verdict in his favour upon a debate with so lame an antagonist as Dr. Anders. Let us at least have foemen worthy of our steel. Dr. Anders would do better to rest his case as Prof. Kittridge, of Harvard, rests it (according to Edwin Reed, "Noteworthy Opinions," p. 55), who advises his classes "not to read Baconian books." Nor does Dr. Anders fail to overlook Mr. Sohmer's clincher—to wit, that if Dr. Anders pronounces every one of his (Mr. Sohmers's) eleven coincidences mere accidental, then he confronts the greatest coincidence of all, namely, that, of eleven random difficulties, every one is explainable upon an identical proposition, namely, that Bacon wrote the plays.

In your July issue Mr. Stotsenburg asks whether that letter from Daniel to Sir Thomas Egerton, published by Collier, is genuine? May I note that it is not? Dr. Ingleby, on p. 248 of his "Complete View of the Shakespeare Controversy"

(London, 1861), disposed of that. And let me add that there is no safety in Shakespearean research from these forgeries without a copy of Dr. Ingleby's book at one's elbow. No one—not the best of us—knows when he may be in the ditch, so industriously did Collier forge documents. For what reason he deliberately set to work to ruin a splendid reputation for faithful and valuable labour is one of the insolvable mysteries of Shakespearean history. B. B. C.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

As to Mr. Stotsenburg's query as to the second marriage of Mrs. Anne Shakespeare, *nee* Hathway, or Whately (there seems no contemporary warrant for spelling it HathAway at all. It is either "Hathwey"—in which case the first name is Agnes—or "Whately"—in which case it is Anne—so that here, as everywhere else where we come to touch a fact connected with William Shakespeare's Stratford biography, we, according to the expressive trapper dialect, "run up a tree.")

Mr. Howard Staunton, who edited his splendid edition of the Plays in London in 1857, arrived at the conclusion that the lady, whatever her maiden name, was married a second time, from the well-known entry of her funeral in the records of Trinity Parish for August, 1623, thus :—

8 { Mrs. Shakespeare
  { Anna uxor Richardi James.

In "New Shakespeareana," Vol. V., page 78, I tried to state all that I could find on both sides touching Mr. Staunton's theory, which you remember Dr. Halliwell-Phillipps pronounced absurd, stating that such bracketings were frequent in the Registers of Trinity Parish, merely denoting that the two funerals occurred the same day, and he was able to give there a fac-simile of the entry, which I replicated in my "New Shakespeareana" article. And I remark that it was referable to no possible state of affairs that I could even guess at, that the relict of the greatest man that ever lived in Stratford, with the grandest monument in the church, who was buried from the greatest house in the town, wife of a lay-warden of the parish, and so on, should be (if she were really Shakespeare's widow) snubbed by the simple entry of her title, while an unknown lady was dignified by mention of her maiden name as well as by her married title. My conclusions in this paper brought out Mrs. Stopes, who in the next "New Shakespeareana" declared that if Mrs. Shakespeare had become Mrs. Richard James, the entry would have been either "Nuper vidua Guglielmi Shakepeare uxor Richardi James," or "Mrs. Anne Shakespeare, *alias* James" (the Mrs. being the usual abbreviation for Mistress), that the brevity of the entry was because "Mistress Shakespeare

was too well known to need further description," "Mistress" being as sure a sign of gentle birth as "Lady," for if not gentle the entry would have been "Widow Shakespeare."

As in the late Moncure D. Conway's Reminiscences Autobiography, he tells of having often discussed this second marriage theory with Mr. Staunton, Dr. Morgan sent my article and this reply of Mrs. Stopes's to him, and Dr. Conway replied. And Dr. Morgan permits me to hand you copies of Dr. Conway's two letters.

"22, East Tenth Street, New York City,
"March 8, 1906.

"My Dear Dr. Appleton Morgan,—I am right glad to see your handwriting again and to know that my autobiography has interested you.

"The paragraph you send me [Mrs. Stopes's reply] appears to me of no value at all. The entry in the Parish Register has been examined by persons very familiar with Parish Registers, and the writer of this paragraph [Mrs. Stopes] would have enforced her evidently foregone conclusion better had she gone through the Register and found another instance of two people buried on the same day and bracketed together. The entry is by no means a sufficient entry for a lady of wealth and distinction as Mrs. Shakespeare was. This writer [Mrs. Stopes] seems to think that the entry of marriages ought to be in the Burial Register. Many of us feel so! It is not correct to say that 'nuper vidua' would have been added after 'James.' Nor is it symptomatic of a trustworthy critic to assume that Anne desired to be buried in Shakespeare's grave. But facts are manageable when there is a poetic myth to be sustained!

"Cordially, Moncure D. Conway."

To this letter Dr. Morgan replied, citing Halliwell-Phillipps' ninth edition, Vol. II., page 372, as follows:—

"This conjecture [of the second marriage] is altogether at variance with the terms of her [Mrs. Shakespeare's] monumental inscription, and brackets of like description are to be seen in other parts of the Register, no fewer than six occuring in the list of baptisms for the year in question—1623. The matter, however, is placed beyond all doubt by the record of the two funerals, as it thus appears in a contemporary transcript of the original notes that were made on the occasion—

August 8, Mrs. Ann Shakespeare.
August 8, Ann, wyfe to Richard James.

And it may be just worth adding, that, in an enumeration of persons remarkable whose names were to be noticed in the Stratford Register, and which was added to the volume toward the close of the seventeenth century, there is included the memorandum, '1623. One Mrs. Shakespeare was buried.'"

To this letter Dr. Conway replied—

"New York, March 16, 1908.

"DEAR DR. APPLETON MORGAN,—I have read the quotation in the 'Outlines,' ninth edition, and it strikes me as untrustworthy. Why is not the 'contemporary transcript' of the original notes located so that it can be verified? I have talked on the subject with Charles Flower, of Stratford-on-Avon, with Horace Furness, Howard Stanton, three learned Editors of Shakespeare, and neither of them mentioned any such 'transcript.' I have found several suspicious things in the 'Outlines,' and do not accept its assertion when the means of verification are withheld. The memorandum in the end of the volume, '*1623. One Mrs. Shakespeare was buricd*,' doesn't bear on the question. Evidently the clergy have been puzzled and '*Mrs. Shakespeare*' becomes '*Mrs. Ann Shakespeare*' in some note, and in some other, '*One Mrs. Shakespeare*'!!! Brackets, except in the Deaths, I did not look for. In Baptisms, brackets (in case of twins) might be looked for. And if there are any in the Deaths, no doubt they would be mentioned by Halliwell-Phillipps. At any rate, it would be necessary in each several case to give us the bracketed names and descriptions so that we could see whether the bracketed people were unrelated. Why should a Shakespeare be bracketed with a James? There is an air of conscious unveracity in all the paragraph.

"Cordially, MONCURE D. CONWAY."

The discussion is very interesting. In my paper in "New Shakespeareana" I tried to state everything on both sides; but, of course, there is nothing but conjecture possible.

As to Mr. Stotsenburg's query as to the alleged letter from Daniel to Sir Thomas Egerton, Dr. Ingleby remarks ("Complete View of the Shakespeare Controversy," London, 1861, page 247): "To the practised eye it betrays its spuriousness at a glance. The paper is of a later date than the time to which the document professes to belong, and the supposition of its being an early copy of a genuine original involves the very improbable presumption that at so early a date documents of this kind were considered, from a literary point of view, as of sufficient interest to be copied for preservation. For no other purpose can we suppose such a copy to have been made. Another suspicious circumstance is that when Mr. Collier himself gives the letter in his 'New Facts' (page 49) he does not give it in SEVENTY places accurately as to details—such as orthography, punctuation, etc."

And as all the other documents produced by Collier are forgeries, there seems no particular reason for supposing this one alone to be genuine.

Yours obediently, JAMES F. REILLY.

No. 23, Park Row, New York, August 13, 1908.